

THE Monthly Repository.

No. CCXXXVII.]

SEPTEMBER, 1825.

[Vol. XX.

An Examination of Warburton's Strictures on Neal's History of the Puritans.

Birmingham, Sept. 2, 1825.

Cum tabulis animum censoris sumet honesti. HOR.

HONOUR and justice have been disregarded by Warburton and by Dr. Southey,* in their accusation of Neal, as an historian. No blush appears to have spread itself over the Prelate's cheek, when he brought against this valuable author the sweeping charge of a want of probity and a neglect of truth; while by the Laureate the indictment has been shamelessly echoed, without investigation and without proof. Warburton, during his official residence at Durham, was supplied with the volumes of the *History of the Puritans*: these, as he informs Hurd,† he read at "breakfast-time," and, in the course of his meal, committed his animadversions to the margin, where they may still be seen.‡ Unhappily for his own reputation, but most auspiciously for the credit of Neal, the strictures are published in Warburton's collective works; § so that we have opportunities of appreciating the merit of these notes. I shall examine them distinctly and separately: the employment is tedious; yet the result, I am persuaded, will not be the less satisfactory. The edition of Neal's *History*, &c., before me, was published, 1793, &c., by Dr. Joshua Toulmin: to the pages of this as well as to those of the edition used by Warburton I shall carefully refer.

(1) Vol. I. 89. [83. T.] Let Toulmin's note be consulted: it is pertinent and decisive. Neal does that from which some modern writers shrink: he cites his authorities; and this not in general terms, but specifically and clearly. Unless Burnet can in the present instance be convicted of incorrectness, the charge against Neal falls directly to the ground.

(2) 178. [160. T.] Warburton asks, Whether Fuller *did* peruse the records of convocation? That he *did*, may well be presumed from his character and undertakings. At any rate, the question does not affect either the judgment or the veracity of Neal, who has not recorded more than his documents warranted.

(3) 186. [166. T.] The note of Neal's editor, should not be overlooked: for it marks his desire of doing justice to Warburton.

It is commonly supposed that Fox, the martyrologist, had little or no church preferment, until he became a prebendary of Sarum. According to Bishop Warburton, whose local situation would particularly enable him to ascertain the fact, "he was also installed in the third prebend of Durham, Oct. 14, 1572," but did not hold it long. It is barely possible that the prelate may have mistaken the individual, and been deceived by the identity of a name, which is far from being rare. Warburton, I cannot well doubt, is correct; the rather, as Fox and Bishop Pilkington, who then filled the see of Durham, were intimate with each other. Yet, as Fox's son* and Thomas Fuller† do not mention the circumstance in their respective lives of the martyrologist, Neal's silence concerning it, cannot in justice or candour be made a subject of blame.‡

(4) 191. [171. T.] Here we have a flippant and tasteless and indefensible

* See the Acts and Monuments, &c., Vol. II. Life prefixed.

† In Abel Redivivus, &c.

‡ The younger son [Dr. Simeon Fox] of the martyrologist, is said to have been one of the two last presidents of the College of Physicians, who used to ride on horseback in London to visit their patients. Ward's *Lives of the Gresham Professors*, p. 266.

* Book of the Church, Vol. II. p. 309.

† Feb. 26, 1765.

‡ In the chapter-library.

§ Vol. I. [1788], pp. 891, &c.

sarcasm on Bucer: it does not touch Neal, and is, in every view, unworthy of attention.

(5) 192. [171. T.] The sentiments and conduct of the Puritans, in relation to the ecclesiastical habits, the cap, the surplice, &c., are recorded by Neal, in the progress of his history: the existence of such conduct and sentiments, is unquestioned; but the justness of them has been impugned by Warburton. In the mean time, Neal's fidelity and ingenuousness are conspicuous. It was the *imposition* of the vestments, which formed the grievance.

(6) 194. [173. T.] In this instance, again, as in numerous other instances, they are opinions and sayings, which Neal honestly relates, that call down the prelate's animadversions: the good faith of the historian he can with no plausibility arraign; and in the vast majority of his strictures it is not even attempted to be brought in question.

(7) 194. [174. T.] The editor's note is most satisfactory. It vindicates Neal's accuracy, and proves that the point in dispute was not indifferent or immaterial. The *decency* of ecclesiastical vestments, cannot justify the *imposition* of them.

(8) 231. [205. T.] With the exception of one clause, Warburton's remark is fair and liberal. But, though his judgment may differ from what Neal expresses or implies, the historian's fidelity is not therefore to be denied.

(9) 240. [214. T.] "The natural right that every man has to judge for himself, and make profession of what he esteems as the true religion," is the grand principle, into which all Protestant dissent must ultimately be resolved. Neal affirms thus much, but does not say that the Puritans of Elizabeth's age, any more than the Conformists, were acquainted with the principle theoretically; so that Warburton's censure on the historian is without foundation.

(10) 243. [217. T.] Neal's historical fidelity, is still unshaken. For the rest, the Bishop's note stands on "the unsteadfast footing" of his own theory of the Alliance of Church and State.

(11) 294. [259. T.] This note involves no question of fact, but simply of sentiment and reasoning. It thus

resembles the far larger proportion of the prelate's strictures. Even were Neal's opinions and arguments as extravagant as many of Warburton's—instead of being, for the most part, eminently judicious—still, his probity remains unimpaired.

(12) 365. [319. T.] "The Bishop of London," [Aylmer,] says the historian, "came not behind the chief of his brethren the bishops in his persecuting zeal against the Puritans:" this zeal he manifested by enforcing ministerial conformity. Upon which accusation Warburton observes, that "it is an unfair charge which runs through the history." He adds, "The exacting conformity of the ministry of any church by the governors of that church is not persecution." I transcribe Dr. Toulmin's note, in reply:

"This is a strange sentiment to come from the pen of a Protestant prelate. There was no persecution then in the reign of Queen Mary. It was no persecution, when the Jewish Sanhedrim agreed, 'that if any man did confess that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.' It was no persecution, when the Parliament imposed the Scots' covenant."

The answer is substantially conclusive. Warburton himself admits that the doing more than simply expelling from the communion of the Established Church a Nonconforming ministry, is persecution. The truth is, such men excommunicate themselves. But why make the terms of conformity narrow and unscriptural? Here lies the guilt: here is the persecution. The prelate almost intimates a doubt, whether the conditions merited not this account of them.

(13) 369. [323. T.] It is the opinion of Bishop W. that Stubbs' punishment, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was "infinitely more cruel than all the ears [so, the printed copy] under Charles I." This language appears stronger than facts will authorize: * but Neal's credit is not involved in the comparison.

(14) 369. [323, 324. T.] In 1580, the Commons appointed a *fast*; and, as it would seem, for themselves ex-

* Hume, we believe, thought here, as Warburton thought.

clusively. What the prelate says of the measure, is just in the abstract, yet has no bearing on the historian.

(15) 372. [326. T.] Neal is blamed by the annotator for not applying far severer terms to such pamphlets as *Martin Mar-Prelate*, &c., &c. Dr. Toulmin, in answer, says of Warburton, "He should have adverted to our author's grave censure of them in chap. viii., and have recollected that the writers on the church side came not behind their adversaries in buffoonery and ridicule." These were the weapons of the age.*

(16) 374. [328. T.] Here Neal's editor administers deserved reproof to the captious annotator. "To act upon principle," remarks Dr. Toulmin, "is highly virtuous and praiseworthy. It is the support of integrity, and constitutes excellence of character. Yet in this instance [the case of the Brownists] Bishop Warburton could allow himself to degrade and make a jest of it. 'It is just the same,' says he, 'with men who act upon passion and prejudice, for the poet says truly,

Obstinacy's ne'er so stiff,
As when 'tis in a wrong belief.'"

I may add, that I complain not of the sentiment itself, but of the Prelate's application of the sentiment. As a general observation, it is true that men of the weakest judgment are proportionably tenacious of their crude statements and opinions.

(17) 380. [333. T.] The labours of the proscribed Nonconformists, in the families which gave them an asylum, had a considerable and highly beneficial influence on the next generation. Neal's statement is correct: he means moral and religious influence: Warburton thinks proper to understand him as speaking of a political influence; and he sneers accordingly.

(8) 381. [334. T.] It is asked by the relate, "Were the Jesuits more faulty in acting in defiance of the laws than the Puritans?" He adds, "I think not. They had both the same plea, Conscience, and both the same provocation, Persecution."

Let us attend to the note of Dr. Toulmin, who says, "This is candid

and pertinent, as far as it applies to the religious principles of each. But certainly the spirit and views of these parties were very different; the former were engaged once and again in plots against the life and government of the Queen, the loyalty of the other was, notwithstanding all their sufferings, unimpeached."

(19) 386. [338. T.] I do not enter upon the questions respecting Presbytery and the consistency of the Puritans of Elizabeth's reign. It is sufficient for me to observe that the laws of history called upon Neal to give a faithful narrative of facts; that he has fulfilled the obligation; and that Warburton does not here oppugn either his veracity or his candour. Toulmin's note on the passage, may be perused with satisfaction and advantage.

(20) 389. [342. T.] Bishop Warburton places it to the account of Neal's spirit of party and prejudice that he complains of two of Brown's followers having been hanged for circulating a seditious book, when Brown, the author of the book, was, on his repentance, pardoned.

Now Dr. Toulmin has clearly shewn that the Prelate was ignorant of the true state of the case; inasmuch as Brown did not repent, did not renounce his principles, until seven years after he was committed to prison, from which he was released, not on his contrition, but at the intercession of the Lord Treasurer.

(21) 405. [355. T.] A sensible observation of Dr. Toulmin's, shews Warburton to be a willing and an unjust censor. The historian relates that the ministers of Kent in their supplication to the Lords of the Council professed their reverence for the Established Church. This language the annotator considers as inconsistent with calling the Established Church an hierarchy that never obtained till the approach of Antichrist. "But," remarks Neal's Editor, "the charge of inconsistency does not lie against the Kentish ministers who speak above, unless it be proved that they were the authors of the pamphlet entitled 'The Practice of Prelates,' which contained the other sentiments."

I will now, for a few moments, dismiss Warburton, and entreat my readers to accompany me in an examination of a famous state-paper, of which

* See Granger's Biog. Hist., &c., 3d ed. i. 203, Note *; and, on the other side, Ward's Gresham Professors, p. 55.

a copy is preserved in Toulmin's edition of Neal's History, &c., [pp. 360—362]: I mean the High Commission issued by Queen Elizabeth in 1583-4. Of this commission Neal says, that "it empowers the commissioners to inquire into all misdemeanours not only by the oaths of twelve men and witnesses, but by *all other means and ways they could devise*; that is by the inquisition, by the rack, by torture, or by any ways and means that forty-four sovereign judges should devise." Hume,* speaking of the same document, employs Neal's language respecting it: while Brodie, actuated by political views, feelings and principles the very opposite of the panegyrist of the Stuarts, attempts† to controvert the statement of Neal and Hume. That statement is, however, correct. The proof of its correctness will be found in an analysis of the commission, and in an abstract of its several paragraphs.

In the first of them power is given to the commissioners to inquire as well by the oaths of twelve good and lawful men, as also by witnesses, and *all other means and ways you can devise*, &c. This paragraph, the reader should know, is confined to the subject of inquiry: not a word occurs here about the restraint or punishment of persons held to be offenders.

The second paragraph, while it gives full power of censuring and punishing, restricts the punishment to *lawful* ways and means: it speaks of penalties and forfeitures, yet of these *according to the forms prescribed in the said act* [of uniformity, in the first year of Queen Elizabeth]. In this paragraph, be it considered, we have not a word about inquiry.

Punishment is exclusively the topic of the third paragraph, which is also silent as to inquiry, and most studiously directs the punishment to be what is *limited and appointed by the laws*.

The fourth paragraph has no bearing on the present question, but regards the deprivation, under certain circumstances, of such individuals as have ecclesiastical livings.

* History, &c., V. 262 [of the ed. of 1792].

† History of the British Empire, &c., I. 196, 197.

In like manner, the fifth paragraph respects offences strictly ecclesiastical: lawful ways and means are to be devised for the searching out the premises, and the offenders are to be punished by fine, imprisonment, censures of the church, or all or any of the said ways at the discretion of the commissioners.

Nothing can well be more illegal than the letter, spirit and tenor of the next, the sixth paragraph, which empowers the commissioners to examine suspected persons on their corporal oaths, for the better trial and opening of the truth, and to punish them, if contumacious, by excommunication, or other censures ecclesiastical, or *by fine, according to your discretions*, &c.

Of the seventh paragraph one clause gives power for the arrest and safe custody of accused or suspected persons: the other contains some instructions in respect of receivers, &c.

In the three remaining paragraphs authority is granted to visit and reform colleges, cathedrals, &c., so far as their statutes are concerned, to tender the oaths of supremacy to all ministers and others compellable by act of parliament, to certify the names of such as refuse it into the King's Bench, and to use a specific seal of office.

Thus I have examined every part of this High Commission. The investigation establishes Neal's care and accuracy: and hence we might fairly argue to his general correctness and governing love of truth. Hume in this instance happens to be right. Why he was never reluctant to set forth the arbitrary measures of Queen Elizabeth, no attentive readers of his *own* Life, and of his History of the Stuart, can need to be informed. As to Brodie, if he had discriminated between the case of inquiry and that of punishment, he would not have contradicted Neal's and Hume's representation of the tyrannical spirit of this state-paper.* In the mode of the investigation the Commissioners were left considerably to their discretion: in the punishment they were bound down by law. Let us now return to Warburton.

* The remark applies to Southey, *ubi supra*.

(22) 459. [399. T.] The Prelate's note in this place, is evidently dictated by his overweening attachment to his theory of *Alliance*: neither the subject nor the illustration of it calls for our regard at present.

(23) 464. [404. T.] Neal is again charged with being partial and inconsistent: his supposed delinquency consists, according to Warburton, in reckoning the Bishop of Litchfield's conduct to be agreeable to law, because in *favour* of the Puritans, though he had before represented the Archbishop's publishing articles without the great seal as illegal, because *against* the Puritans. Dr. Toulmin's answer is complete: the articles, in one case, are very different from the object of the judicatory, in the other; nor does Mr. Neal decide on the legality of the measure in either instance.

(24) 466. [407. T.] The "quaint trash" of which the Bishop now complains, will be found in Isaac Walton's *Life of Hooker*, but perhaps was borrowed from Dr. Gauden, who had also "lately written and published" a memoir of that famous man. Which of these authors Warburton meant to designate as a "fantastic life-writer," I know not. But where is Neal's disingenuousness? He cites the words as they were delivered: and he must be a hasty reader, who does not perceive their import; and he a captious annotator who is offended at the introduction of them. Is not Calvinism intended by Geneva, and Arminianism by Canterbury? This language reflects not personally on either Hooker or the Archbishop.

(25) 470. [413. T.] The Prelate highly eulogizes Hooker's answer to Mr. Travers' supplication. I am not concerned to question the propriety of the eulogium, but shall merely observe that it has no reference to Neal.

(26) 481. [418. T.] I copy a part of Toulmin's note, and am sorry that I have not room for the whole of it. "Bishop Warburton," says the editor, "condemns the offering of the bill, [for a further reformation,] as such a mutinous action in the Puritan ministers, that he wonders 'a writer of Mr. Neal's good sense could mention them without censure, much more that he should do it with commendation.' It is not easy to see," adds Dr. T., "where his Lordship found Mr. Neal's commendation of this bill: the editor can discern a bare state of the proceedings only. And, by what law, or by what principle of the constitution is the offering of a bill and the representation of grievances to the House an act of mutiny?"

To this question I will subjoin another. When the Prelate speaks of the conduct of the Puritans as *mutinous*, does he not lose sight of their *civil* privileges as subjects of England, and intimate that their obedience was to be implicit?

(27) 482. [421. T.] Neal simply records Ballard's language, but is not responsible for its justness.

(28) 483. [422. T.] *Relief* the Puritans certainly needed: that they wished for a separate establishment, does not appear.

(29) 488. [427. T.] Whatever Bishop W. might think or say, it is clear that the Puritans did not attempt to enlist the populace on their side, but submitted their alleged grievances to "the powers that were." Not that the language and deportment of men of either party could in all respects be vindicated.

(30) 491. [429. T.] When the Puritans declared that they assumed no authority to themselves, they perhaps meant to reflect on the authority exercised against them. I agree, however, with Dr. T., that there was, as Bishop Warburton hints, some impropriety in the disclaimer.

(31) 495. [433. T.] Could Warburton with equity or candour suppose that Neal must answer for the conclusiveness of the arguments which it became his duty to record?

(32) 496. [433. T.] The Prelate's note refers to Dr. Reynolds' letter, at the foot of the page. Whether Reynolds be right or wrong, is a consideration quite immaterial to the defence of Neal.

(33) 493. [434. T.] I may allow, at least for argument's sake, that Warburton is correct in his estimate of the nature and effect of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. But, here again, his opinion has no bearing on his charges against the historian of the Puritans.

(34) 508. [444. T.] "Among the divines," says Neal, "that suffer-

ed death for certain libels, was the Rev. Mr. Udal." The historian proceeds to relate the case of this individual, who died in goal, as the consequence of his long and close imprisonment. Warburton is pleased to be extremely severe on Neal for using this language, which the Prelate censures as "unworthy a candid historian or an honest man." "But," observes Dr. Toulmin, "when Udal died quite heart-broken with sorrow and grief through imprisonment and the severe treatment he met with on account of the libels, his death was as much the consequence of the prosecution commenced against him, as if it had been inflicted by the executioner." At most there was only an inaccuracy in the expression.—In illustration of the editor's plea for his author, I may be permitted to make a few remarks. The late Bishop Percy * having occasion to mention the death of the fourth Earl of Northumberland adds, "who fell a victim to the avarice of Henry the VIIth." Are we then to conclude from these words that the Earl had been put to death by this monarch? The truth is, the nobleman was slain in a popular insurrection produced by his attempt to carry the royal designs into execution. But is Bishop Percy's language "unworthy a candid or an honest man"? More accurate, it, assuredly, might have been.

In 1629, Sir John Elliot was illegally committed to prison for his parliamentary opposition to the measures of the court: and Hume informs us (VII. 277), that "because Sir J. Elliot happened to die while in custody—he was universally regarded as a martyr to the liberties of England."

Now I ask every individual, who has sense and feeling, whether he was not justly regarded as a martyr to those liberties, and whether such expressions were "unworthy of candid and honest men"?

By the answer let Neal in this instance stand or fall: his faithfulness and integrity endure even the present accusation; upon which I have dwelt the longer, because it is by far the most serious and plausible of the charges framed against him by the Prelate, and because it needs only to be investigated, in order to be refuted.

JOHN KENTISH.

Fragments of the History of Religious Denominations in Dukinfield during the last and to the middle of the preceding Century.

AN ancient Episcopal Chapel is yet remaining in this place, now much dilapidated; the architecture of which shews it to have been erected as early as Henry the VII.'s reign. Not long after this period it became attached, as a domestic place of worship, to the mansion-house of the Dukinfield family, as the gabled front and the frogged pinnacles of the hall † denote it to be a structure of the succeeding reign, and a part of the roof of which rests upon the western end of the chapel. After the reformation of the church it probably never had its episcopal jurisdiction renewed, the Dukinfields then using it for family devotion, and appointing their own chaplains to officiate therein. In 1649, Colonel Dukinfield was Governor of Chester and High Sheriff of the coun-

* Reliques of Ancient Poetry, (5th ed.,) Vol. I. p. 97.

† A SONNET TO DUKINFIELD HALL.

Seat of long ancestry, the wise, the brave,
The generous, the determin'd to be free,
How much, neglected mansion, now the grave
Of former greatness, owe we unto thee!
How much of legal right and liberty
(Infring'd by sov'reign rule) was then maintain'd
When civil discord and dissension reign'd,
And Patriot valour kingly power withstood,
And Freedom's robe was stain'd by patriot blood!
Here where oft met the Sabbath multitude
To pray, to praise, and hear heaven's high behest—
Ah, how profan'd! Now beasts obscene intrude,
And bats, and fowl, the sty's obstreperous guest
Pollute sepulchred dust, and violate its rest.

ty. Previous to this he had become acquainted with Samuel Eaton, a celebrated preacher in the city of Chester, to whom he offered sufficient inducement to settle him in Dukinfield. In 1650, Mr. Eaton published a work in 2 vols., entitled, "The Mystery of God Incarnate, or the Word made Flesh, cleared up. By Samuel Eaton, Teacher of the Church of Christ at Dukinfield." This book he addressed "To the faithful and dearly beloved saints of Jesus Christ in and about Chester, especially to all such who have known the doctrine, read the papers of Mr. John Knowles, and who have been his familiar hearers and followers." Mr. Eaton's congregation, it appears, chose Mr. Knowles as his successor at Chester, for which situation the latter gentleman quitted Gloucester, where he had been previously stationed. His great sin was that of Arianism, and against the influence of his opinions on that subject Mr. Eaton's work is principally directed.

The celebrity of character, and Mr. Eaton's ability as a divine, were, most likely, the temptation which induced the founder of Quakerism, the celebrated George Fox, to visit Dukinfield, as early in his life as the year 1647. He, in his Diary, Vol. I. p. 97, makes the following statement: "Passing on, I went among the professors at Dukinfield and Manchester, where I staid awhile, and declared truth among them." From the ambiguity of Fox's language, it is a point yet unascertained at what place he first became a preacher. Tradition has recorded this as the first village in which he essayed his dormant powers, and points out the place where, mounted on the stocks, he delivered his first public exhortation. Several communications appeared about two years ago in the *Monthly Magazine*, on the subject of Fox's early preaching; but as it is not a point of much importance, no one then claimed that distinction for Dukinfield. There is, however, great probability in this being the case, as it is evident from Fox's own account of his early life, that his intention in travelling from place to place, was to converse with those men most eminent for their piety and superior sanctity of character. His mind likewise appears to have been early imbued with the

ideal susceptibility of supernatural impressions. Hence any extraordinary occurrence connected with the manifestation of such pretensions was sure to fix his attention. In this view, somewhere in this neighbourhood, he was induced to visit a woman who pretended to a longer fast than hers of Tutbury, but the imposture of whose character, as he himself relates, he soon detected. His early opponents describe him as first emerging from obscurity at Manchester. The author of the "Snake in the Grass," in the preface to his "Essay concerning the Divine Right of Tythe," describes him as a journeyman to a shoemaker in Manchester, "who, from going on foot, and often barefoot, mounted by his preaching trade on horseback, with his man carrying his cloak before him, to act the gentleman, and leaving £1000 behind him for printing his books." So it appears he first drew attention as a sectary, in that age of sectarian fecundity at Manchester. Dukinfield being only seven miles from that town, and being mentioned by himself, in connexion with it, he is most likely to have first tried those talents here, the force of which every part of the kingdom afterwards became acquainted with. The house is yet standing in which the Friends' meetings were first held, but we have now no members of that persuasion resident in the place.

From this time, and during the Protectorate, and to the termination of the Stuart dynasty, opposition to episcopal authority, appears to have had much influence in the religious principles and conduct of the inhabitants of this neighbourhood.

The accession of William and Mary to the throne brought with it toleration to Dissenters, and the history of Dukinfield Chapel, and the succession of its ministers, which appeared in the *Monthly Repository*, XVIII. p. 681, brings the Presbyterian establishment in this village down to the present period.

The United Brethren, or Moravians, in the year 1743, formed a small society here, which was supplied with labourers (preachers) from Smith-House and Fulnec, in Yorkshire; but the present meeting-house was not completed until 1751, and the choir houses in 1757. The chapel having

been built at the sole expense of Mr. William Walker, he procured it to be licensed as a place of worship, and a donation, amounting to half the expense of the original cost of the building, being afterwards made by Mr. Barham, Mr. Walker gave the congregation immediate possession of the whole. This building, in the lapse of time, became too small for the auditors who attended it, and an addition of nearly one half more room was made to it in 1774 by Mr. Walker, and with his usual generosity devoted to the society. In 1785, this congregation removed to Fairfield, a neat village, built by them on a plan of the utmost regularity, about half way from this place to Manchester. The establishment there has become one of the most conspicuous belonging to the Brethren in the kingdom.

Of other sects this township is not altogether unfruitful. A Calvinist chapel was erected here in the year 1806; one for the Methodists, near Stayley Bridge, in 1812; and one for the Roman Catholics is now lately roofed in.

Difference of opinion being the result of a very imperfect state of knowledge, while the imperfection of the one continues, uniformity in the other must not be expected. But surely the time is not far distant when Christians will more perfectly agree to differ. We no longer contend about the use of the surplice, or the gown, the band or the velvet cap, as requisites for the decoration of a preacher. The attitudes of kneeling, standing or sitting at the communion table, have no longer volumes devoted to ascertain the propriety of each as superior to the other. Could we say so much for the forty and five baptismal shades of distinction, by which some Christians choose to designate themselves, the press would be freed from much superfluous matter. But this conclusion is unquestionable—while the great Head of the Church permits his followers to indulge such variety of sentiment on subjects of religion, all have an equal claim and title to assemble together for the purpose of instructing one another. Hence the propriety of places of worship being set apart for that purpose, and if this neighbourhood has a greater variety of such places than others can boast of, their

prevalence, may be traced to that firm and enlightened spirit by which our ancestors became the defenders, the victims and the conquerors of Christian liberty in the great struggle of Nonconformity.

W. HAMPSON.

Memoirs of Samuel Pepys, Esq.

(Continued from p. 454.)

THE new monarchical court was no sooner established than it became a mart of corruption, women being no less industrious than men in the brokerage of iniquity.

June 22nd, 1660.—“Mr. Hill (who for these two or three days hath constantly attended my Lord) told me of an offer of £500, for a *Baronet's dignity*, which I told my Lord of in the balcone of this gallery, and he said *he would think of it*.—Thence to my Lord's and had the great coach to Brigham's, who told me how my *Lady Monk* * *deals with him and others for their places, asking him £500, though he was formerly the King's coach-maker, and sworn to it*.—23d.—To my Lord's lodgings, where Tom Guy came to me, and there staid to see the King touch people for the king's evil.† But he did not come at all, it rayned so; and the poor people were forced to stand all the morning in the rain in the garden. Afterward he touched them in the banquetting-house. With my Lord, to my Lord Frezendorfes,” (Swedish Ambassador,) “where he dined to-day. He told me that he had obtained a promise of the *Clerke of the Acts* place for me, at which I was glad.—25th.—Thence to the Admiralty, where I met Mr. Turner, of the

* Feb. 12th, Pepys calls this “lady” simply “Monk's wife;” monarchy was not then set up. Lord Braybrooke thus annotates upon Pepys's text when he calls her “Duchesse of Albemarle,” l. 97. “Anne Clarges, daughter of a blacksmith and bred a milliner; mistress and afterwards wife of General Monk, over whom she possessed the greatest influence.” This lady appears again and again in the Diary, as the patron of learned men and the first personage at feasts. The *Diarist* speaks of her, notwithstanding, in plain English.

† For an account of this disgusting imposition on popular credulity, see *Mon-Repos*. VIII. 93—96, and XIV. 22.

Navy Office, who did look after the place of Clerke of the Acts. He was very civil to me and I to him, and shall be so. *There come a letter from my Lady Monk to my Lord about it this evening*, but he refused to come to her, but meeting in Whitehall with Sir Thomas Clarges, her brother, my Lord returned answer, that he could not desist in my business; and that he believed that General Monk would take it ill if my Lord should name the officers in his army; and therefore he desired to have the naming of one officer in the fleet.—26th.—To Backewell, the Goldsmith's, and there we chose 100*l.* worth of plate for my Lord to give Secretary Nicholas." I. 59, 60.

Pepys relates (June 29, 1660), that he got his warrant from the Duke to be Clerk of the Acts, but that he heard with sadness that Mr. Barlow, his predecessor in the office, was yet living, and coming up to town to look after his place. This he told "his Lord" of, who bade him get possession of his patent, and "he would do all that could be done to keep him out." Next day, he had a letter from one Turner, offering him 150*l.* to be joined with him in his patent, and to advise him how to improve the advantage of his place, and to "keep off Barlow." After many fears and some negotiations, Pepys bought Barlow's interest, by agreeing to give him 50*l.* per ann., if the salary were not increased, and 100*l.* per ann., in case it were 350*l.* This was no bad bargain, as the former possessor was "an old consumptive man," and the place was worth by Pepys's confession 1000*l.* This is a specimen of the way in which the court forgot old loyalty and rewarded new.

The entry of July 1st shews that the Diarist got on faster with his finery than the Church of England did with hers:

"This morning came home my fine camlett cloak, with gold buttons, and a silk suit, which cost me much money, and *I pray God to make me able to pay for it*. In the afternoon to the Abbey, where a good sermon by a stranger, but *no Common Prayer yet*." I. 62.

After relating (July 5) that his brother Tom brought him his *jackanapes*

coat with silver buttons, he goes on to say that the King and Parliament were entertained by the city with great pomp, but alas! it was a wet day, and *many a fine suit of clothes was spoiled*. How it fared with the above-mentioned *jackanapes coat* we are left to conjecture, but there Pepys was, and he describes his humble entertainment, and the notable project of a knavish fellow-secretary. "Met with Mr. Cooling, my Lord Chamberlain's Secretary, who took me to dinner among the gentlemen waiters, and after dinner into the wine celler. He told me how he had a project for all us Secretaries to join together, and get money by bringing all business into our hands." I. 63.

Mr. Pepys always kept his eye upon his interests at Court. The employment of his Sundays may be put in evidence. Not only did he on these days shew himself off in some new and fine article of apparel, but he also contrived frequently to worship with great men. (We should not be very uncandid if we were to strike out the word *with* from the conclusion of this last sentence.) His memorandum for July 8, 1660, for example, is "Lord's Day. To White Hall Chapel, where I got in with ease by going before the Lord Chancellor, with Mr. Kipps. Here I heard very good musique, *the first time that ever I remember to have heard the organs, and singing men in surplices, in my life*." He adds, with a better feeling than he sometimes shews, "The Bishop of Chichester (King) preached before the King, and made a great flattering sermon, which I did not like that the clergy should meddle with matters of state." I. 64.

Again, on the 29th of July, Pepys was at Whitehall Chapel, and his record of the day proves that the hierarchy was steadily growing. "I heard a cold sermon of the Bishop of Salisbury's, Duppa's, and *the ceremonies did not please me, they do so overdo them*." I. 68, 69.

The Presbyterians were not yet thrown off by the Court. Aug. 12. Mr. Calamy preached at Whitehall, and made, Pepys says, a good sermon. He says also of the old Nonconformist, "He was very officious with his three reverences to the King, as others do." I. 71.

They that know the history of Charles II. only as a man of pleasure, may be surprised at learning, as is stated by Pepys, that he was an early riser, in which character, the Diarist adds, he tired all the people about him. I. 72.

The "old clergy," that is, those that were before the Civil War, and did not conform to the Commonwealth, are mightily praised by common-place writers: let Pepys relate a contemporary opinion of them:—"Aug. 21st. I met Mr. Crewe and dined with him, where there dined one Mr. Hickeman, an Oxford man, who spoke very much against *the height of the now old clergy, for putting out many of the religious fellows of colleges, and inveighing against them*" (the old clergy) "*for being drunk.*" Ib.

The following entry justifies some of the papers of the Spectator that appear to be *badinage*:—"Aug. 30th. This the first day that ever I saw my wife wear *black patches* since we were married." I. 73.

We sometimes find Pepys in company that we did not expect, and see him and his companions oddly engaged. For example, Sept. 18th, he was at the Mitre Tavern in Wood-street, (a house of the greatest note in London,) where he met "Mr. White, formerly chaplain to the Lady Protectress and still so." Jere. White was the author of one of the first English books on Universal Restoration, a learned and liberal divine. Pepys goes on to say that report stated that White was "likely to get my Lady Francesse" (the daughter of the Protector) "for his wife." This is at variance with a story told by Noble, (Memoirs of the Cromwell Family, I. 148, &c.,) from Oldmixon, of White's paying his addresses to this lady, and on being discovered by the Protector in her apartments, pretending that he was entreating her intercession on his behalf with her waiting-maid; whereupon Oliver had him immediately, and on the spot, married to the astonished girl. The story is, that the couple so strangely brought together lived in comfort for fifty years. Lady Frances was married first to Robt. Rich, of the Warwick family, and afterwards to Sir John Russell, whom she survived

52 years, dying 1721, 2.—Some of Pepys's party, of whom Jere. White was one, "fell to handy-cappe, a sport that" he "never knew before." I. 75.

How far back we seem to be thrown when we read, Sept. 25th, I did send for a cup of *tee*, (*a China drink*,) of which I never had drank before"! I. 76.

Pepys was, Oct. 4th, at Westminster Abbey, and "saw Dr. Frewen translated to the Archbishoprick of York." There were besides 5 bishops, all in their habits." "But, Lord!" exclaims this Church-of-England man, "at their going out, how people did most of them look upon them as *strange creatures, and few with any kind of love or respect.*" This is one of unnumbered proofs that the English people were well-nigh weaned of superstition by the popular government of the last twelve years, and that the Restoration carried them back to mental childhood.

The curiosity of Pepys led him to witness the execution of some of the Regicides, brought

— to the unjust tribunals, under change of Times,
And condemnation of the ingrateful multitude.

He does not exult in these butcheries, but, on the contrary, does justice to the victims of Monk's treachery. The mob, probably under some excitement from the creatures of the Court, shewed themselves on these occasions "right royal" and sanguinary.

"13th. I went out to Charing Cross, to see Major-General Harrison hanged, drawn and quartered; which was done there, he looking as cheerful as any man could do in that condition. He was presently cut down, and his head and heart shewn to the people, at which there was great shouts of joy. It is said, that he said that he was sure to come shortly at the right hand of Christ to judge them that now had judged him; and that his wife do expect his coming again. Thus it was my chance to see the King beheaded at White Hall, and to see the first blood shed in revenge for the King at Charing Cross." I. 78, 79.

It was probably on the recollection of some such passage as this that a patriot-poet threw off the following indignant lines:

Curse on the shouts of that licentious throng,
 Whose merriment (more brutal than the song
 Of mad Agave, when wild Hæmus o'er
 Her Pentheus' mangled limbs the mother bore)
 Proclaims the fall of Liberty:—ye shades
 Of mighty chiefs, from your Elysian glades
 Look down benign, avert the dire pre-
 sage,
 Nor with two Charles's brand one sinful age.
 O, my poor country! what capricious tide
 Of Fortune swells the Tyrant's motley pride!
 Around his brows yon servile prelates twine
 The stale and blasted wreath of Right Divine;
 While harlots, like the Coan Venus fair,
 Move their light feet to each lascivious air.
 Hence with your orgies! Righteous Heaven ordains
 A purer worship, less audacious strains.
 When falls by William's sword, (as soon it must,)
 This edifice of bigotry and lust,
 The Muse shall start from her inglorious trance,
 And give to satire's grasp her vengeful lance,
 At Truth's historic shrine shall victims smoke,
 And a fresh Stuart bleed at every stroke.
 Thine too, perfidious Albemarle, (whose steel,
 Drawn to protect, embroil'd Britannia's weal,
 Shrank from thy coward arm, consign'd the reins
 Of power to Charles, and forged a nation's chains,)
 Compar'd with nobler villanies of old,
 High deeds, on plates of adamant enroll'd,
 Shall meet the felon's undistinguish'd fate,
 Sure of contempt, unworthy of our hate.*
 "Our most religious King," as Charles II. was first styled in the *Common Prayer*, was next day at Church, where, no doubt, thanks were given to the Almighty for allowing the Stuart faction to murder and mangle some of the best men of the nation, and Pepys tells us how this and another angust worshiper were employed

during *divine service*: "14th. To White Hall chappell, where one Dr. Crofts made an indifferent sermon, and after it an anthem, ill sung, which made the King laugh.—Here I also observed, how the Duke of York and Mrs. Palmer did talk to one another very wantonly through the hangings that parts the King's closet, and the closet where the ladies sit." I. 79.

The sight of parts of the dismembered patriots, Oct. 20th, would seem to have affected Pepys properly: "This afternoon going through London, and calling at Crowe's the Upholsterer's, in Saint Bartholomew's, I saw limbs of some of our new traitors set upon Aldersgate, which was a sad sight to see; and a bloody week this and the last have been, there being ten hanged, drawn and quartered." I. 80. The next passage shews that this observer was not overcome by his humanity—the last words are a singular instance of *sang froid*: "21st. George Vines carried me up to the top of his turret, where there is Cook's head set up for a traytor, and Harrison's set up on the other side of Westminster Hall. Here I could see them plainly, as also a very fair prospect about London." Ib.

Pepys relates that, Nov. 1st, he paid a visit with Sir W. Penn (father of the celebrated Quaker) to Sir W. Batten's, at whose table he met an old friend who reminded him of his early anti-royal predilections. "Here dined with us two or three more country gentlemen; among the rest Mr. Christmas, my old school-fellow, with whom I had much talk. He did remember that I was a great roundhead when I was a boy, and I was much afraid that he would have remembered the words that I said the day the King was beheaded, (that were I to preach upon him, my text should be, "The memory of the wicked shall rot,") but I found afterwards that he did go away from school before that time." I. 82.

This shrewd observer relates the arrival next day of the Queen Dowager, widow of Charles I., and remarks, "I observed this night very few bonfires in the city, not above three in all London, for the Queen's coming; whereby I guess that (as I believed before) her coming do please but very few." I. 83.

Under the same date is an entry which might have lessened Lord Bray-

* Wodhull's *Equality of Mankind*, in Pearch's Collection of Poems, IV. 246, 7.

brooke's surprise (Memoir, *passim*) at Pepys being suspected of Popery: "In Paul's church-yard" (*Paul's* betrays the "Roundhead") "I called at Kirton's, and there they had got a *masse-book* for me, which I bought, and cost me 12s.; and, when I come home, sat up late and *read in it with great pleasure to my wife, to hear that she was long ago acquainted with it.*" I. 83.

The following passage under Nov. 4, discovers how slowly the people returned to Church-of-Englandism. The concluding sentence shews Mr. Pepys a little uxorious. We cannot stay to inquire into the consistency of this minute relating to the "black patch," with that already quoted on the same subject.

"4th. Lord's Day. In the morning to our own church when Mr. Mills* did begin to nibble at the Common Prayer, by saying, 'Glory be to the Father,' &c., after he had read the two Psalms; but the people had been so little used to it, that they could not tell what to answer. This declaration of the King's do give the Presbyterians some satisfaction, and a pretence to read the Common Prayer which they would not do before, because of their former preaching against it. After dinner to Westminster, where I went to my Lord's, and, having spoke with him, I went to the Abbey, where the first time that I ever heard the organs in a cathedral. My wife seemed very pretty to-day, it being the first time I had given her leave to weare a *black patch.*" Ib.

The tragedies that were now acting at Charing Cross were less of the King's devising than of the Parliament's, in which were many apostates who were afraid of their former comrades, should any turn of affairs give them power, and apprehensive that if they lived they might tell inconvenient tales. Charles would probably, as the following passage intimates, have let the King's Judges alone, but more

from constitutional carelessness, than from humanity.

"19th. I went with the Treasurer in his coach to White Hall, and in our way, in discourse, do find him a very good-natured man; and talking of those men, who now stand condemned for murdering the King, he says that he believes, that if the law would give leave, the King is a man of so great compassion that he would wholly acquit them." I. 85.

Pepys cannot record the brutal decree of the Parliament with regard to the bodies of Cromwell, &c., without disapprobation.

Plots now begin to thicken, sham plots and plots real. One was never wanting when the object was to take up or to take off an old friend or a suspected enemy. There was an insurrection of the 5th monarchy men, but there was probably some Castles or Oliver at the bottom. Pepys thus relates this mad attempt—we give his narrative mixed up with his other matters.

"1660, 61. Jan. 7. This morning, news was brought to me to my bedside, that there had been a great stir in the city this night by the Fanatiques, who had been up and killed six or seven men, but all are fled. My Lord Mayor, and the whole city had been in arms, above forty thousand. Tom and I and my wife to the theatre, and there saw 'The Silent Woman.' Among other things here, Kinaston the boy had the good turn to appear in three shapes: first as a poor woman in ordinary clothes to please Morose; then in fine clothes, as a gallant, and in them was clearly the prettiest woman in the whole house: and lastly as a man; and then likewise did appear the handsomest man in the house. In our way home we were in many places strictly examined, more than in the worst of times, there being great fears of these Fanatiques rising again: for the present I do not hear that any of them are taken.

"8th. Some talk to-day of a head of Fanatiques that do appear about, but I do not believe it. However, my Lord Mayor, Sir Richard Browne, hath carried himself very honourably, and hath caused one of their meeting-houses in London to be pulled down.

"9th. Waked in the morning about six o'clock, by people running up and

* "Daniel Mills, D.D., thirty-two years rector of St. Olave's, Hart Street, and buried there October 1689, aged sixty-three. In 1667, Sir Robert Brooks presented him to the rectory of Wanstead, which he also enjoyed till his death."

down in Mr. Davis's house, talking that the Fanatiques were up in armes in the city. And so I rose and went forth; where in the street I found every body in armes at the doors. So I returned and got my sword and pistol, which however I had no powder to charge, and went to the door where I found Sir R. Ford, and with him I walked up and down as far as the Exchange, and there I left him. In our way the streets full of train bands and great stir. What mischief these rogues have done! and I think near a dozen had been killed this morning on both sides. The shops shut and all things in trouble.

"10th. After dinner Will comes to tell me that he had presented my piece of plate to Mr. Coventry, who takes it very kindly, and sends me a very kind letter and the plate back again, of which my heart is very glad. Mr. Davis told us the particular examinations of these Fanatiques that are taken; and in short it is this—these Fanatiques that have routed all the train bands that they met with, put the King's life-guards to the run, killed about twenty men, broke through the city gates twice, and all this in the day time, when all the city was in armes, are not in all above thirty-one. Whereas we did believe them, because they were seen up and down in every place almost in the city, and had been in Highgate two or three days and in several other places, to be at least 500. A thing that never was heard of that so few men should dare and do so much mischief. Their word was, 'The King Jesus and their heads upon the gates.' Few of them would receive any quarter, but such as were taken by force and kept alive, expecting Jesus to come here and reign in the world presently, and will not believe yet. The King this day come to towne." I. 90, 91.

We have, I. 93, a notice of the first 30th of January service; following which is a record of Mrs. Pepys's employment of this day, not altogether agreeable to feminine usage:

"30th, Fast-day. The first time that this day hath been yet observed: and Mr. Mills made a most excellent sermon upon 'Lord, forgive us our former iniquities;' speaking excellently of the justice of God in punishing men for the sins of their ances-

tors. To my Lady Batten's; where my wife and she are lately come back from being abroad, and seeing of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, hanged and buried at Tyburne."

The turn of the election in the city of London, 1660, 1, shews that the Nonconformists were yet the prevailing and in one sense popular party.

"March 20th. The great talk of the towne is the strange election that the city of London made yesterday for Parliament-men; viz. Fowke, Love, Jones, and men, that, so far from being episcopall, are thought to be Anabaptists, and chosen with a great deal of zeale, in spite of the other party that thought themselves so strong, calling out in the Hall, 'No Bishops! No Lord Bishops!' It do make people to fear it may come to worse by being an example to the country to do the same. And indeed the Bishops are so high, that very few do love them." I. 98.

The next extract relates to a Presbyterian minister, well known by his writings, Zach. Crofton, ejected from St. Botolph's, Aldgate. He had been zealous for the King's Restoration, but falling into controversy with Bishop Gauden upon the obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant, he gave such high displeasure to the ruling party, that he was sent to the Tower. Here he lay a long time, afraid to sue his Habeas Corpus, lest his life, which was threatened, should be taken away. With difficulty he at length obtained his liberty, and with a wife and seven children removed into Cheshire, where he was again imprisoned. Once more procuring his release, he set up a grocer's shop; then took a farm at Little Barford, Beds.; and finally kept a large school in the parish of Aldgate.

"1660, 1, March 23rd. Met my uncle Wight, and with him Lieutenant Colonel Baron, who told us how Crofton, the great Presbyterian minister that had preached so highly against Bishops, is clapped up this day in the Tower. Which do please some, and displease others exceedingly." I. 99.

Pepys distinguishes between the Presbyterians and the Fanatics, meaning apparently by the latter all the Nonconformists not Presbyterians.

"April 7th. To White Hall, and

there I met with Dr. Fuller, of Twickenham, newly come from Ireland, and took him to my Lord's, where he and I dined; and he did give my Lord and me a good account of the condition of Ireland, and how it came to pass, through the joyning of the Fanatiques and the Presbyterians, that the latter and the former are in their declaration put together under the names of Fanatiques." *Ib.*

On the 13th of this month Pepys witnessed the notable piece of kingcraft, which he had before attempted in vain to see: he felt but little reverence for the royal miracle-monger.

"Met my Lord with the Duke, and after a little talk with him, I went to the Banquet-house, and there saw the King heale, the first time that ever I saw him do it; which he did with great gravity, and it seemed to me to be an ugly office, and a simple one." *I. 100.*

Pepys gives a very detailed account of the Coronation of Charles: the spectacle delighted him not a little. He records with satisfaction an accident which befel Serjt. Glynn, one of the legal Proteuses of the day.

"1660, 1, April 23. Thus did the day end with joy every where; and, blessed be God, I have not heard of any mischance to any body through it all, but only to Serjt. Glynn, * whose horse fell upon him yesterday, and is like to kill him, which people do please themselves to see how just God is to punish the rogue at such time as this: he being now one of the King's Sergeants, and rode in the cavalcade with Maynard, to whom people wish the same fortune." *I. 105.*

Another of Pepys's "Lord's-day" entries relates to a popular preacher, and to a Nonconformist, who began to give way, and to use the "Lord's-day" for his pleasure.

"May 12th. At the Savoy heard Dr. Fuller preach upon David's words, 'I will wait with patience all the days of my appointed time untill my change comes;' but methought it was a poor

dry sermon. And I am afraid my former high esteem of his preaching was more out of opinion than judgment. Met with Mr. Creed, with whom I went and walked in Gray's Inn-walks, and from thence to Islington, and there eat and drank at the house my father and we were wont of old to go to; and after that walked homeward, and parted in Smithfield: and so I home, much wondering to see how things are altered with Mr. Creed, who, twelvemonths ago, might have been got to hang himself almost as soon as to go to a drinking-house on a Sunday." *I. 106.*

It is well-known that the Puritans and their immediate descendants made conscience of not drinking healths. The scruple it seems actuated one of the most accomplished and polite of the Presbyterian ministers, "the silver-tongued Bates."

"May 23rd. Dinner at my Lord Mayor's with a great deal of honourable company, and great entertainment. At table I had very good discourse with Mr. Ashmole, wherein he did assure me that frogs and many insects do often fall from the sky, ready formed. Dr. Bates's singularity in not rising up nor drinking the King's nor other healths at the table, was very much observed." *I. 108.*

From another minute, relating to the same period, we learn that other religious scruples were yet somewhat respected:

"May 26th. Sir W. Batten told me how Mr. Prin (among the two or three that did refuse to-day to receive the sacrament upon their knees) was offered by a mistake the drinke afterwards, which he did receive, being denied the drink by Dr. Gunning, unless he would take it on his knees; and after that by another the bread was brought him, and he did take it sitting, which is thought very preposterous." *Ib.*

Mr. Pryn, whose singularity is described in the last extract, was yet a thorn in the sides of the bishops:

"May 30th. This day, I hear the Parliament have ordered a bill to be brought in for restoring the bishops to the House of Lords; which they had not done so soon but to spite Mr. Prin, who is every day so bitter against them in his discourse in the House." *I. 109.*

* "He had been Recorder of London; and during the Protectorate was made Chief Justice of the Upper Bench. Nevertheless he did Charles II. great service, and was in consequence knighted and appointed King's Serjeant, and his son created a Baronet. *Ob. 1666.*"

The following passages shew, what we have always suspected, and have before intimated in this account of Pepys's book, that for some time after the Restoration, it was doubtful whether the Church of England would be able to stand.

"July 26th. Mr. Hill, of Cambridge, tells me, that yesterday put a change to the whole state of England as to the Church; for the King now would be forced to favour Presbytery, or that the city would leave him: but I heed not what he says, though upon inquiry I do find that things in the Parliament are in great disorder.

"Aug. 3rd. At Cambridge, Mr. Pechell,* Sanchy, and others, tell me how high the old doctors are in the University over those they found there, though a great deal better scholars than themselves; for which I am very sorry, and, above all, Dr. Gunning. At night I took horse, and rode with Roger Pepys and his two brothers to Impington.

"4th. To Church, and had a good plain sermon. At our coming in the country people all rose with so much reverence; and when the parson begins, he begins, 'Right worshipfull and dearly beloved,' to us. To Church again, and after supper, to talk about publique matters, wherein Roger Pepys told me how basely things have been carried in Parliament by the young men, that did labour to oppose all things that were moved by serious men. That they are the most prophane, swearing fellows that ever he heard in his life, which makes him think that they will spoil all, and bring things into a warr again if they can." l. 112, 113.

SIR,
THE unfortunate note appended to Dr. Channing's Sermon on the Ordination of Mr. Gannett, has been the subject of much discussion, both in this country and in America. It is not my wish to revive this discussion; but deeply impressed by the powerful eloquence of the discourse itself, and the original manner in which it treats a subject of high importance, I cannot but hope it will be extensively read and duly appreciated. At the same

time, may I be permitted to make a remark or two upon a passage which it were to be desired that the worthy author had rendered a little more full and complete than it appears to be in its present state? Dr. Channing has done well for the cause of truth and the ministers of truth in pressing upon the latter the duty of keeping pace with the spirit of the age, of enlightening their own minds as far as possible, and ennobling and enriching their statements of doctrine by the united strength of tasteful language and energetic sentiment. In all this I cordially acquiesce. But perhaps Dr. C. goes rather too far in his estimate of the advantages to be derived from this high state of mental cultivation; or rather, in his anxiety to fix his standard of excellence high enough, he a little depreciates the power of simple truth. It is true he does endeavour to shew that there is no such thing as simple or "naked truth." "Truth," says he, "is always humanized in passing through a human mind." This is, no doubt, philosophically true. Yet surely there is a practical incorrectness in the inference which Dr. Channing would have us draw, if he does not allow that the majority of hearers are fully able to separate the human from the divine in the word spoken to them. And that the test to which, ostensibly at least, preaching is brought by Christian hearers, is, as it ought to be, the word of God. "Who does not know," asks Dr. C., "that the sublimest doctrines lose in some hands all their grandeur, and the loveliest all their attractiveness?" Now he is not speaking in this place of false doctrine—he is speaking of truth—the whole tenour of the argument seems to bear me out in this assertion. Assuming this then to be correct, his meaning must be, that the sublimest, the *most true*, the most attractive doctrines, may lose all their power simply by being conveyed in an unpleasant manner. This is a discouraging doctrine to the "brother of low degree," but it is comforting to feel the persuasion that it is not warranted by experience. Practically, I am persuaded that the most important truths of the gospel are received with more reverence, more lasting good consequences, and more universally salutary effects, when

* "John Pechell, made Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge, 1679."

they owe their influence over the mind less to the power of a striking preacher than when they are acquired under circumstances of less excitement. I would not at all dispute the fact, that talent united with right views of Christian truth is to be highly appreciated. I would go farther, and say that it is every preacher's duty to labour at the attainment of every kind of excellence—only let it be conceded, and it is a consideration that should both cheer the humble and check the proud, that converts to all that is of supreme importance in Christian truth have been made and are still making by preachers of very subordinate mental powers and attainments. I have often felt it to be an unfortunate thing for a congregation, when the reverence and admiration which are due to religion, are so transferred to a particular preacher, that it becomes a matter of difficulty to relish the same truths when presented in a less attractive dress. I should not fear that any ill effects will be produced on minds of long-established piety by attendance on the ministrations of a very captivating preacher, but I doubt whether young people will be materially strengthened either in knowledge of or regard to religion by such attendance, unless accompanied by that earnest and careful home-instruction which may lead them to estimate truth far more highly than the *form* under which it may happen to be spoken to them.

Were I competent to offer advice at all to a religious parent, there is none, perhaps, which would more frequently rise to my lips than this: "If you wish your child's religious principles to wear well, see that they stand not on the uncertain foundation of ordinances, or individual teaching. Lead him to the Bible, fix in his heart the affecting lessons it teaches; make him practically and habitually a religious being by leading him to prayer, and form his dispositions by all those kind and gentle practices which may best secure the love of what is amiable and praiseworthy. Make him feel that these things are perfectly distinct from the exercise of talent; that mental powers are valuable only when accompanied by the fear of God and the love of our fellow-creatures. Especially win his heart to the love and

admiration of the character of Jesus, that model of each and every virtue. This strong previous sense of religion will alone lift the mind above the fluctuations which take place in the piety of many individuals when under the ministrations of a preacher more or less judicious, more or less attractive. Do not fear that your child will lose the power of discriminating between the good and bad. If he has early been taught to understand the chief doctrines of Christianity and their application, he will prefer what accords best with his previous knowledge, and the style of preaching he will least like will be that which appears most remote from scriptural truth; but beware lest in your estimate of the importance of public worship, you attach an undue value to PREACHING."

Having said thus much on what appears to me an objectionable passage in Dr. Channing's Sermon, I must again express my cordial admiration of the manner and matter of the greater part of that beautiful production. Our ministers are largely indebted to him for the excellent advice he offers, and which they have shewn themselves not slow to accept. May every new light which genius, taste and talent can bring to the cause of religion be freely brought, and may a supreme love of truth consecrate these gifts!

E.

The Religious Opinions of Napoleon Bonaparte in his last illness and just previous to his Dissolution.

No farther seek his merits to disclose,
Nor draw his frailties from their dread
abode;
There they alike in trembling hope repose,
The bosom of his Father and his God!
GRAY.

Islington,

August 27, 1825.

SIR,
H^{AVING} sent you a paper at the commencement of the year, (pp. 1—7,) on the *Infidelity*, or rather *Scepticism* of Lord Byron, which I have understood was acceptable to your readers, I am tempted to communicate what I have ascertained concerning the *religious opinions* of Napoleon Bonaparte. He was the most

extraordinary character of the age. Any thing respecting such a man, especially on the important topic of religion, must be gratifying to the curiosity.

Dr. O'Meara, in his interesting work, *A Voice from St. Helena*, has several paragraphs on the subject. But I shall draw my information from a more recent source—*The Last Days of the Emperor Napoleon*, by Dr. F. Antommarchi, his Physician. This gentleman attended him after Dr. O'Meara had left him, was with him in his last illness, and witnessed his dissolution. He went over to him from Italy, and has returned with a pension, for his attendance on the illustrious exile, whose sufferings he mitigated, whilst his work may be pronounced a monumental tribute of regard to his memory.

The paragraphs I shall transcribe shall be taken chronologically. Napoleon died May 5th, 1821. He had been long ill, of a liver complaint, brought on by the climate of St. Helena, which allows few of its inhabitants to exceed *forty* years of age, and is awfully fatal to visitants from any country.

Dr. Antommarchi, on his arrival at St. Helena, found Bonaparte (about nine months previous to his dissolution) much worse for want of exercise, and forced him into his garden. "One day," (says Dr. A.,) "as Bonaparte was arranging a bed of French beans he perceived some small roots, and began a dissertation upon the phenomena of vegetation. He analyzed and descanted upon them with his usual sagacity, drawing from them the conclusion of *the existence of the Supreme Being*, who presides over the wonders of nature! 'You do not believe in all that, Doctor—you physicians are above those weaknesses. Tell me, you who are so well acquainted with the human frame, who have searched it in all its turnings and windings; have you ever met with *the soul* under your scalpel? In *what organ*?' I hesitated to answer. 'Come, be sincere: there is not a physician that believes in God, is there?' 'No, Sire; they are seduced by Mathematicians.' 'How so? Mathematicians are generally religious. However, your recrimination reminds me of a singular expression used by one of them. I was convers-

ing with L., and congratulating him upon a new work he had just published. I asked him how it happened that the name of God, so often used in the works of Lagrange, had never once occurred in his.' 'It is,' answered he, 'because I have not found it necessary to have recourse to that *hypothesis*!'"

Thus it appears that Bonaparte had an ill opinion of the creed of medical men. Few of them, indeed, are Atheists, but more Deists, though many have written excellent treatises in behalf of revealed religion. Of this fact *Cheyne* and various others might be adduced. The avocations of the faculty are against their attendance on public worship, and hence their low repute for any sort of piety.

What Bonaparte thought of the providence of God does not exactly appear; but he often refers to his *destiny*; and of *human life* he imagined that a limit was assigned it, beyond which it could not be protracted. His physician one day proposing medicine, to which he had an insuperable aversion, he replied, "Doctor, no physicking. We are, as I have often already told you, a *machine* made to live. We are organized for that purpose, and such is our nature. Do not counteract *the living principle*. Let it alone; leave it the liberty to defend itself; it will do better than your drugs! Our body is a *watch* that is intended to go a *given* time. The watchmaker cannot open it, and must, in handling it, grope his way blindfold and at random. For once that he assists and relieves it, by dint of tormenting it with his crooked instruments, he injures it ten times, and at last destroys it!"

Not following the advice of his physician, either as to medicine or exercise in that dreadful climate, the Emperor became worse and worse. On March 19, 1820, he addressed Dr. A. in the following affecting manner: "Doctor, what a delightful thing rest is! The bed is become for me a place of luxury. I would not exchange it for all the thrones in the world. What an alteration—how *fallen* am I! I, whose activity was boundless, whose mind never slumbered, am now plunged in a lethargic stupor, and must make an effort to raise my eyelids! I sometimes dictated upon different

subjects to four or five secretaries, who wrote as fast as words could be uttered; but then I was Napoleon; now I am no longer any thing: my strength, my faculties forsake me. I do not live, I merely exist!"

His sister Eliza dying also at this time, he was much dejected, and began to think seriously of his own latter end. His remarks are too striking to be omitted on this occasion. "The Emperor rose, leant upon my arm, and looking steadfastly at me, said, 'You see, Doctor, Eliza has just shewn us the way. *Death*, which seemed to have overlooked my family, now begins to strike it; *my* turn cannot be far distant—what think you?' 'Your Majesty is not yet near the term of your existence; you are still destined for some glorious enterprise!' 'Ah! Doctor, you are young, full of health; but I—I have no longer any strength, activity or energy left. I am no longer Napoleon. You endeavour in vain to revive hope, to recall life on the point of escaping. Your care is without avail against *fate*; its decrees are immutable, its decision without appeal. The first person of our family who will follow Eliza to the grave is that great Napoleon who here drags on a miserable existence, who sinks under its weight, but who, however, still keeps Europe in a state of alarm! It is thus, Doctor, that I consider my present situation. Young as you are, you have a long career before you, but for *me*, all is over; and I repeat, that my days will soon end on this miserable rock!"

On the 19th of April, 1821, the Emperor rallied, after severe paroxysms of suffering; when Dr. A. tells us, "The Emperor rose at two p. m., and seated himself in his arm chair; he was in good spirits, finding himself much better than usual, and asked to be read to. Seeing that General Montholon rejoiced in that amelioration of health, and that I also, without being able to assign any cause for it, as I did not entertain any more hope than before, gave way to the same feeling; he looked at us with a placid smile, and said, 'My friends, you are not mistaken; I am better to-day; but I feel nevertheless that my *end* is approaching! After my death every one of you will have the consolation of returning to Europe, some of you will

see their relations again, others their friends, and I shall join my brave companions in the *Elysian fields*! Yes," (added he, raising his voice,) "Kleber, Dessaix, Bessieres, Duroc, Ney, Murat, Massena and Berthier, will all come to meet me; they will speak to me of what we have done together, and I will relate to them the last events of my life! On seeing me again they will all become once more mad with enthusiasm and glory, and we will talk of our wars with the Scipios, Hannibal, Cæsar, Frederic! There will be pleasure in that, unless," added he, laughing, "it should create an alarm in the *next world* to see so many warriors assembled together!" This sally of the imagination was, no doubt, suggested by the recollection of a fine passage in the sixth book of Virgil, where the poet thus delineates a similar congress of warriors in the Elysian fields:

Here Teucer's ancient race the Prince surveys,
The race of heroes born in happier days;
Ilus, Assaracus, in arms revered,
And Troy's great founder, Dardanos, appear'd;
Before him stalk'd the tall majestic train,
And pitch'd their idle lances on the plain;
Their arms and airy chariots he beheld;
The steeds, unharness'd, grazed the flowery field;
Those pleasing cares the heroes felt alive,
For chariots, steeds and arms, in death survive!
Others beneath a laurell'd grove were laid,
And joyful feasted in the fragrant shade!

However, this seems to have been the last effort of Napoleon to affect pleasantry in his deplorable condition. Soon after we find him (two days only) sending for his priest, Vignali. When he came, "Abbé," said he, "do you know what *chambre-ardente* (a room in which dead bodies lie in state) is?" "Yes, Sire." "Have you ever officiated in one?" "Never, Sire." "You shall officiate in mine!" He then entered into the most minute detail on the subject, and gave the priest his instructions at considerable length. His face was animated and convulsive, and I was following with uneasiness the contraction of his features, when he observed in mine, I know not what, which displeased him. "You are

above those weaknesses,' said he; 'but what is to be done? I am neither a philosopher nor a physician. I believe in God, and am of the religion of my father. It is not every body who can be an Atheist.' Then turning again to the priest, 'I was born a Catholic, and will fulfil the duties prescribed by the Catholic religion, and receive the assistance it administers. You will say *mass* every day in the chapel, and will expose the holy sacrament during forty hours! After my death you will place your altar at my head in the room in which I shall lie in state; you will continue to say mass, and perform all the customary ceremonies, and will *not cease to do so*, until I am under ground.'" Dr. A. then adds, "The Abbé withdrew, and I remained alone with Napoleon, who censured my supposed incredulity. 'How can you carry it so far?' said he. 'Can you not believe in a God, whose existence every thing proclaims, and in whom the greatest minds have believed?' 'But, Sire, I have never doubted it. I was following the pulsations of the fever, and your Majesty thought you perceived in my features an expression which they had not.' 'You are a physician,' he replied, laughing; and then added, in an under tone, 'Those people have only to do with *matter*; they never believe any thing.'"

Not long after, Dr. A. informs us, that one day "Napoleon spoke of religious dissensions, and of the plan he had formed in order to reconcile all sects. Our reverses occurred too soon to allow him to carry that plan into execution; but he had at least re-established religion, and that was a service, the results of which were incalculable." *To reconcile all sects* in France, or in any other part of Christendom, is an *Herculean* task, of which the Emperor was not apprized. Perhaps no man except himself would have thought of such a thing, and assuredly no other man would have been emboldened to attempt its accomplishment. That happy event must be reserved for better times. It is, indeed, no inconsiderable portion of what divines have denominated, the *Millennial glory*! In the mean time, it will be both the duty and felicity of Catholic and Protestant, of Church-

man and Dissenter, laying aside their most repulsive peculiarities, to live together in peace, love and Christian charity.

And now approaches the last awful scene. Two days previous to his death Vignali, the priest, administered the *Viaticum* to the Emperor, who, on the 5th of May, 1821, thus affectingly breathed his last. "*Head army!*" were the final words he uttered; he was in a state of delirium and insensibility. At eleven A. M., icy coldness of the extremities, and in a short time of the whole body, eye fixed, lips closed and contracted, breathing slow, deep sighs, piteous moans, convulsive movements, which ended by a loud and dismal shriek! I placed a blister on his chest and on each thigh, applied two large sinapisms on the soles of the feet, and fomentations on the abdomen, with a bottle filled with hot water. I also endeavoured to refresh the Emperor's lips and mouth, by constantly moistening them with a mixture of common water, orange-flower water and sugar, but the passage was spasmodically closed; nothing was swallowed; all was in vain! The intermittent breathing and mournful sound continued, accompanied by a violent agitation of the abdominal muscles; the eye-lids remaining fixed, the eyes moved and fell back under the upper lids; the pulse sunk and rallied again. It was eleven minutes before six o'clock—Napoleon was about to breath his last—a slight froth covered his lips—he was no more! Such is the end of all human glory."

Dr. A. proceeds to tell us, that "having finished the melancholy operation of dissection, I detached the heart and stomach, and put them into a silver vase, filled with spirits and wine. I afterwards connected the separate parts by a suture, washed the body, and made room for the *valet de chambre*, who dressed it, as the Emperor was usually dressed during his life:—Drawers, white kerseymere breeches, white waistcoat, white cravat, and over that a black one, fastened behind with a buckle; the ribbon of the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, the uniform of Colonel of the *Chasseurs de la Garde*, decorated with the Orders of the Legion of Honour, and of the Iron Crown; long boots, à

lé cuir, with small spurs, and, lastly a cocked hat! Thus dressed, Napoleon, at a quarter before six, was removed from the drawing room, into which the crowd immediately entered. The sheet and linen that had been used in the dissection of the body, were carried away, torn and distributed: they were stained with his blood, and every one wished, therefore, to have a fragment of them! It had not been possible to embalm the body, the whiteness of which was really extraordinary. It was deposited upon one of the small tent beds, furnished with white curtains, as funeral hangings! The cloak of blue cloth which Napoleon had worn at the battle of Marengo served to cover him. The feet and hands were exposed to view, at his right side was his sword, and on his chest a crucifix! At some distance from his body was the silver vase in which I had been obliged to deposit his heart and stomach. Behind his head was an altar, at which the priest, habited in his surplice and stole, recited prayers! All the persons of his suite, officers and servants, dressed in mourning, were standing on his left. Dr. Arnott watched over the corpse, which had been placed under his responsibility."

The Emperor was interred with military pomp, near a favourite fountain, agreeably to his own request, and the *weeping willow* overshadows his grave! This was stripped high as the hand could reach by the populace, immediately after his interment; such was their regard for his memory.

Nor will it be irrelevant to mention, that in the course of the last month, according to the public prints, *George the Fourth* planted, or permitted to be planted, in Kew Gardens, a *slip of the willow* that overshadows the grave of Bonaparte! This may prove the greatest *vegetable curiosity* in that famed botanical repository. It is a slender memorial of a man who once made kings tremble on their thrones, and scattered dismay throughout the earth! Our gracious Monarch is of too noble a disposition to *war with the dead*. He had already erected at Rome a tomb to the memory of the Stuarts; for it has been well said, "The existence of such a monument diminishes nothing from the dignity

of that throne, which, founded on the suffrages of a *free people*, may well afford to be generous to fallen tyranny."

From the preceding account it appears that NAPOLEON BONAPARTE was neither *Atheist* nor *Deist*, but a *Catholic*, living and dying in the religion he was born and educated. His creed he took upon trust, having never examined it. In this respect he bore a resemblance to the great majority (noble and ignoble) of the Christian world. One praise he had, nor must it be withheld from him. However, he may have sinned against *civil liberty*, he never violated the fair form of *religious freedom*. He had even planned "*the reconciliation of the sects*"! And could he have achieved it, he would have deserved more glory than he ever acquired, though that is confessedly greater than has fallen to the lot of the monarchs either of ancient or modern times. It would have been a moral triumph, an unparalleled victory.

This truly great man revered the rights of conscience. Unlike his predecessors on the throne of France, he never wore the blood-stained garb of persecution. In his situation this is so unusual a thing that it should be lauded to its utmost extent. It is his redeeming quality. And by the *righteous and merciful Judge of all the earth*, it will not be forgotten in the day of retribution. The Stuarts and Bourbons have nothing of this kind to impart relief to the darkness that broods over their memory! Man is at best a mixed character. We must take our fellow-creatures as we find them. Even Hannah More remarks, in her recently-published work, *the Spirit of Prayer*, "Let us not look to any superior virtue, to any native strength of *our own*, but let us look with a lively gratitude to that *mercy of God* which has preserved us from temptations to which others have yielded. Above all, let us look to that *preserving and restraining grace* which is withheld from none who ask it. Without this all-powerful grace, Latimer might have led Bonner to the stake; with it, Bonner might have ascended the scaffold a martyr to true religion! Without this grace, Luther might have fattened on the sale of

indulgences, and with it Leo the Tenth might have accomplished the blessed work of the Reformation."

With the *political* character of the Emperor of France I have no concern. On this topic individuals of the first discernment have been, and ever will be, divided. No doubt he was an instrument in the hands of the Supreme Being to accomplish much good, and, that good once effected, he fell like a star from the heavens to rise no more! The sins or aberrations of his public life were severely visited e'er he quitted this sublunary scene. Of the injustice and cruelty of his captivity he incessantly complained. Indeed, the mortifications he experienced, and the bodily pains he endured on *the rock of St. Helena* were beyond conception. If aught of suffering on earth can expiate offences, *his* were expiated! But the mighty mind was not to be subdued. His passion of *ruling amid a blaze of military glory*, never forsook him. It played around his imagination, and revelled amidst the shattered fibres of his broken heart. He pursued the phantom till "the last gaudy colour died!"

The invasion of Spain, and the expedition to Russia, were the proximate causes of his destruction. Samson-like, he in his wrath tore down the pillars which upheld the vast fabric of his ambition, and perished beneath its ruins. *Death* alone, the universal conqueror, humbled its victim to the dust! His *life*, checquered beyond all example in the annals of biography, inculcates weighty lessons, whilst his dissolution, awfully terrific to those who witnessed it, sealed the tranquillity of nations, and perpetuated the repose of the world.

J. EVANS.

SIR,

Sept. 5, 1825.

I OBSERVE in the notice to Correspondents in the *Christian Observer* for August, that the Editor considers that the Dissenters of this country "are not allowed to have Steeples and Bells." With regard to steeples he is certainly incorrect, for there is no law to controul any denomination in the form of their religious structures. Steeple or no steeple is a question purely of taste and economy. But there is a general persuasion that bells are prohibited to Non-

conformists; on what it is founded, however, I am at a loss to conjecture. Can it be that this noisy music in any place but a consecrated church-tower might be indicted as a nuisance? Yet I have heard that one or more of the Dissenting chapels in the North have a bell; and if one, why not two or more, if the worshipers fancied the jangle? Perhaps some one of your correspondents learned in the law will inform us, once for all, how the matter stands? I am no lawyer, but I apprehend that every Dissenting congregation is empowered by the Toleration Act to use every privilege in relation to buildings, music and worship which is exercised by any Church of the Establishment. Why, indeed, should bells be interdicted to us any more than organs or bass viols or trumpets or even the pitch-pipe?

A LOVER OF CONCORD.

SIR,

IT may be curious to know by what arguments I can pretend to meet the overwhelming evidence against the genuineness of the celebrated controverted text, the *Three Heavenly Witnesses*. These arguments are comprehended in the object with which John wrote the verse, and in the sense which, if the sentiments of the impostors against whom he composed it be considered, it bears by an easy and obvious interpretation. This object and this sense, if ascertained and admitted, render the forgery of the passage morally impossible, account for the defect in its external evidence, and dissipate into air the objections made by Porson, Griesbach and others against its authenticity. I address the pamphlet in *Three Letters to the Editor of the Quarterly Review*, because of the decided part which that Journal took in reviewing Dr. Burgess's *Vindication*. The critic having expressed his curiosity to know what new proofs the Bishop could produce, and his opinion that the verse was generally deemed spurious, is thus addressed by me: "I believe, Sir, no publication has contributed more to diffuse and establish a general conviction of the spuriousness of the verse than the *Quarterly Review*; not merely on account of the vast influence it has on public opinion, but because of the superior force and clearness with

which you analyzed the controversy, and, if the grounds on which you proceeded were admitted, the justness of your decision. My object is to shew that this ground is entirely mistaken; and to open a new path of inquiry which shall inevitably lead to the re-establishment of the verse in the hearts and conviction of mankind. Important and curious as the question of its authenticity is in itself, it has a far higher claim on your attention and that of the public, on account of the consequences it involves. If I prove the genuineness of this text, the orthodox faith, whether established by power or by prejudice, will receive a shock which shall shatter its very foundations, and bring it at no distant period completely to the ground; while on the other hand, additional strength and lustre will be given to the evidences of Christianity, as it came from the hands of Christ and his apostles. This consideration more than mere curiosity, must, if founded on truth, inevitably engage you again in the controversy, and induce you to employ your powerful pen in refuting my views. I then, Sir, summon you a second time to the field; and I pray God that you may come in the exercise of that Christian spirit of which you have given me and others a fine example in your review of this question. Mistake me not: this summons is an invitation, not a challenge. Whatever confidence I have in my cause, I have none in myself that would warrant me in defying your hostility. I wish you to come forth, not that I might combat you, but that I might enlist under your banners; that if in the main I am right, I might receive your assistance—if otherwise, your opposition, to come at a final decision, and through you, give the nation an opportunity to know the issue of a discussion which, if taken in all its bearings, is one of the most momentous and interesting that has ever engaged the attention of the Christian world."

The Unitarians have ever been the most strenuous adversaries of the verse. Mr. Belsham, Dr. Carpenter, Mr. Kenrick and Mr. Fox have done all they can, to fasten on the public mind a conviction of its forgery. These gentlemen will feel it their duty to attend to the new views unfolded in

these Letters and come forward if convinced of their error publicly to acknowledge it. If they should still continue of the same opinion, let them state their objections, and I engage either to remove them, or, if I be unable to triumph, candidly to own the validity of their reasonings whenever they have any weight. Truth is our common object, and as I expect courtesy and candour from them, they may depend on the exercise of the same Christian spirit from me.

In discussing the question, my thoughts were necessarily directed to Porson's Letters against Travis. I felt an instinctive desire to single out this classical champion of England as most worthy of my lance; and I flatter myself that in every rencontre, I have brought him, like Goliath by the sling of David, prostrate to the ground. Mr. Frend was in habits of intercourse with him at the time he wrote his celebrated Letters; and as that gentleman is not unacquainted with the state of the controversy, he may think fit to meet me in the Repository, and attempt to justify the views of his late illustrious friend.

BEN DAVID.

Clapton,
August 21, 1825.

SIR,
THE original of the annexed part of a letter from Dr. Toulmin is in the very valuable collection of *autographs*, belonging to Mr. Upeot, of the London Institution, who obligingly permitted me to transcribe it.

The date and place were, no doubt, at the beginning of the letter, which has been lost, as well as the direction. Dr. Toulmin resided at Taunton from 1765 to 1804, when he removed to Birmingham, and the date must have been before 1777, when he published his *Memoirs of Socinus*, for which he was, evidently, now collecting materials.

By a passage in the letter it appears to have been addressed to Dr. Calder, who died a few years since, and of whom there are some notices in your volume for 1816 (XI. 345). Of Dr. Jeffries who died in 1784, I gave an account in your XIIIth Volume, (p. 752,) taken from Dr. Toulmin's *Memoir* of his friend in the *Protestant Dissenters' Magazine* (VI. 3-5).

The "translation" of "the Life of

Socinus," mentioned in the letter, was by *Biddle*, and entitled "The Life of that incomparable Man, *Faustus Socinus Senensis*, described by a Polonian Knight. London, Printed for *Richard Moone*, at the seven stars in *Paul's Church-yard*, near the great North-doore. 1653." This publication, and several of the same tendency, were the natural consequences of that toleration, which, to the disgrace of the *Long Parliament*, was a good effect of their lawless expulsion by Cromwell. Those inconsistent asserters of freedom appear, indeed, with a few illustrious exceptions, to have been profoundly ignorant of the great truth, that religious liberty is the most important among civil rights.

To this translation is prefixed a short address "to the Reader," signed J. B., which thus commences: "The Life of *Socinus* is here exposed to thy view, that, by the perusal thereof thou maist receive certain information concerning the man, whom ministers and others traduce by custome, having (for the most part) never heard any thing of his conversation, nor seen any of his works, or if they have, they were either unable or unwilling to make a thorow scrutiny into them, and so no marvel, if they speak evil of him." The translator proceeds to say of *Socinus* "that the vertues of his will were not inferior unto those of his understanding, he being every way furnished to the work of the Lord; that he opened the right way to bring Christians to the unity of the faith and acknowledgment of the Son of God; that he took the same course to propagate the gospel that Christ and the apostles had done before him, forsaking his estate and his nearest relations, and undergoing all manner of labours and hazards, to draw men to the knowledge of the truth; that he had no other end of all his undertakings, than the glory of God and Christ, and the salvation of himself and others, it being impossible for calumny itself with any colour to asperse him with the least suspicion of worldly interest; that he of all interpreters explaineth the precepts of Christ in the strictest manner, and windeth up the lives of men to the highest strain of holiness." Then, referring his reader to "the works of

Socinus himself," he thus concludes: "Though thou beest not thereby convinced that all which *Socinus* taught is true, (for neither am I myself of that belief, as having discovered that, in some lesser things, *Socinus*, as a man, went awry, however, in the main, he hit the truth,) yet for so much of Christ as thou must needs confess appeareth in him, begin to have more favourable thoughts of him and his followers."

I have the original of *Przypcovius* in a very small volume entitled *Vita F. Socini Senensis, descripta ab Equite Polono*, 1656. It is, I believe, also prefixed to the works of *Socinus*, among the *Fratres Poloni*.

It is to be regretted that the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* of *Sandius*, is not yet brought before the English reader, though it appears to have been, probably for several years, in another modern tongue. That service, especially to Unitarians, was, I believe, expected some years since from the very competent pen which has done so much justice to the *Racovian Catechism*, as your readers may be reminded by referring to the Review of that work in several parts of your XVth Volume.

J. T. RUTT.

"I have by me *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum a Sandio*, lent me by Mr. Merivale, in which there is an abridged history of the Socinians. I suppose the French is a translation of this, and want to number either that or the original amongst my books. The Unitarian Tracts were lent me by the same gentleman. I find these books difficult to be procured, as they are very scarce.

"I have received the Life of *Socinus*, with which you have indulged me. It is a translation of *Przypcovius's* Life of this great man. Since your book came to hand, I have been so fortunate as to meet with the *Racovian Catechism* in Latin, a neat copy and good edition. I think it would make a useful publication by itself, and has no immediate connexion with the Life of *Socinus*. It would, in my opinion, prove a very serviceable manual of polemical divinity to common readers; if printed so, as to be sold and dispersed at a low price. I could prepare an edition for the press soon, whilst

my other work stood still, to which, I would wish to *give time*. I have requested Dr. Jeffries to take yours and Dr. Kippis's sentiments on this head. Yours, indeed, I hope to have from your own pen. You can also direct me, where I can meet with the clearest and justest account of Sabelianism.

"But it is time to release you from this long scroll, and these tedious questions. In my situation, there are few with whom I can converse on these points, or from whom I can receive much intelligence. This makes me more desirous to engage the assistance and benefit of Dr. Calder's extensive enquiries and communicative temper: and more so, as your friendship here flatters my vanity: my pride is gratified by the connexion. And I hope the indulgence is not so vicious, but you may contribute to it.

"I am with great esteem for your character and learning, and with warmest wishes that Divine Providence may assist and succeed all your useful labours,

Dear Sir,

Your affectionate Friend and Brother,
and obliged humble Servant,
JOSHUA TOULMIN."

SIR,

Penzance.

SCRIPTURE criticism is one of the most valuable departments of your Repository, and one which I doubt not you are desirous to see filled. I shall therefore make no apology for sending you a few remarks on the first verses of John's Gospel. Nothing now indeed can be expected on a topic so vastly hackneyed as this, but old and obvious reflections are often allowed to lie by neglected, and need to be brought forth to light and notice almost as much as if they were new discoveries. I am led to this remark by observing that that interpretation of the celebrated passage alluded to which was embraced by the fathers of English Unitarianism, Lardner, Priestley and Lindsey, and which they themselves had derived from an intimate acquaintance with Christian antiquity, has been nearly supplanted, in the works of the more recent advocates of the cause, by one which they had deliberately rejected, and which can pretend to no higher antiquity than the days of Socinus. For

my own part I am convinced that this change has been altogether for the worse, and very detrimental to the Unitarian cause; I shall therefore take the liberty of stating some objections, insuperable as they appear to me, to this Socinian explication. Socinus was indeed its author, and claims it as his own; a circumstance in itself not a little suspicious. For what likelihood is there that the true sense of so notable a passage of Scripture should have occurred to no one till the middle of the sixteenth century? Whereas the sense approved by Lardner and Priestley was, in the main, coincident with that of the early fathers in general, men who used the language of the New Testament as their vernacular tongue. The interpretation of Socinus has however been adopted by the editors of the Improved Version, and has in my humble opinion nearly destroyed the value of that work. The ancient Unitarian interpretation has always been treated by the orthodox with respect, as being ingenious and subtle at least if not sound; but the other I have always observed to be regarded by them with unmingled scorn and disgust. When, therefore, a Trinitarian takes up the Improved Version, and turning, as he naturally does, to this place, perceives the rendering alluded to, he closes the book with contempt, and thinks he has seen enough to lay the question at rest for ever. But let us now examine the passage ourselves.

We have first a gratuitous and unnecessary transposition of the words. For, *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*, we read "*the Word was in the beginning*." This inversion of the order gives a strained and inelegant effect to the passage, and what end it answers is best known to those that made it; but let that pass. "*And the Word was with God, and the Word was a God.*" A God! Of course therefore there are more Gods than one, and the God mentioned in the first clause of this verse is a different God from that mentioned in the latter clause. An awkward dilemma this for a Unitarian. The repugnance which this rendering at once excites will, I believe, be too great to be increased by argument; but it will, notwithstanding, be proper to notice what is alleged in its de-

fence. Origen and Eusebius, we are told, argue from the omission of the article in the clause *Θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος*, that the *λόγος* was not one and the same, *ἐν καὶ ταύτῳ*, with the Father, the Supreme God. It must be granted that they consider this circumstance as indicating some inferiority or subordination in the nature of the *Logos*, but it by no means follows, that had they understood English, they would have approved such a rendering as the present, which represents the Word as a separate, distinct God. In common with the other Fathers they regarded the *Λόγος* as existing in the essence of the Father, and partaking of his undivided Deity.

It is further urged, and we readily concede, that an inferior use of the name God occurs several times in the Old Testament, and in quotations from it in the New: as for instance, "*It is written in the law, I said ye are Gods,*" speaking of rulers: or, again, "*Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people,*" in a like sense. I answer, that such expressions are no more than ancient Hebraisms, occurring only in passages found in or quoted from the Old Testament, and never forming a part of the current style of the New. It is most improbable that a passage of such dignity and gravity as that before us should be couched in such obsolete and fantastic language. It is doing very little in such cases to shew that in some extraordinary instances a word has been used in this or that sense: the question is, what is that ordinary and sober sense in which it was proper to use it in the passage under examination.

It appears to me not a little strange to take the phrase, *the Word*, merely as a synonym for the name of Jesus Christ. If the writer merely intended to say that Jesus Christ was in the beginning, and was with God, why does he designate him thus abruptly by this singular name, by which he never calls him afterwards? What proof have we that those to whom he wrote were prepared to understand him in this way of speaking? There is not a single instance in the New Testament where this phrase, *the Word*, passes as a known and distinguishing appellation, or proper name,

of Jesus Christ. He is, indeed, called *the Word of God* in the Revelation; but only in such a way as he receives various other titles, such as King of kings, Emmanuel, the Lord our righteousness, and others; but none of these are received and distinguishing appellations, nor would any writer use them as such who wished to be understood. But if, by *the Word*, we understand with Lardner and Priestley, that principle of light and life which, though essentially inherent in the Deity, emanated from him in due time, and being infused into the person of Jesus, dwelt among us in the form of human nature; this idea, mysterious indeed, but neither unintelligible nor absurd, gives due significance to all the language of the Evangelist, harmonizes with the theological style of the age when the gospel was written, and corresponds in the main with the sense which all the early fathers gave to the passage. These are surely no mean arguments in its favour.

But I think the rock of offence for the Socinian interpretation is yet to come. *Ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο*. The world was made by him; so read the orthodox, and so does Socinus; but the Improved Version, imputing to the text a most astonishing ellipsis, makes bold to render it, The world was *enlightened* by him. Socinus is obliged to propound that, by the world being made, we must understand that the world was *reformed*, or that *the world* means *the new creation*, which was, no doubt, the work of Christ. Then the difficulty takes a new form, for the question occurs how it could be said that the new creation knew not Christ? The figure ellipsis allows a writer to omit what the sense of a passage already sufficiently suggests. If this is the case with the world *enlightened*, as here inserted, the reader may omit this word, but will still perceive that it is implied in those which remain. Impartial reader, do you find this to be so? It is as plain a matter in English as in Greek, although I have most satisfaction in referring you to the original. It has been said, that the word *ἐγένετο* cannot signify *was made*. I answer, that the word *γεννηθαι* signifies to be brought into existence in any form or manner, and is applied in this sense to all sorts of

things, as the following quotations will manifest: *σεισμος εγενετο*, Matt. viii. 24; *φωνη εγενετο*, Mark i. 11; *το σαββατον δια τον ανθρωπον εγενετο*, Mark ii. 27; *ανθρωπος της καθ' ομοιωσιν Θεου γεγονοτας*, James iii. 9; *εις το μη εκ φαινομενων τα βλεπομενα γεγονεναι*, Heb. xi. 3. To these phrases, that before us, the *ο κοσμος εγενετο*, *the world was made or came into existence*, is perfectly analagous, and this rendering appears to me, in a critical point of view, entirely unobjectionable.

But not such is the Socinian rendering of a subsequent verse. *Και Λογος σαρκε εγενετο*. And the word *was flesh*. The word *εγενετο* is thus taken as merely equivalent to *ην*, or, as the logicians term it, it is used simply as the copula of the proposition. Now I call on those who favour this translation to produce a single instance in which this word *γενεσθαι* is used in such a manner. It is altogether foreign to its meaning. It always signifies either to come into existence, or to pass from one condition to another. A transition, or change of state, is always implied by this word. Socinus, indeed, flourishes finely, and says, "Nemo qui Græcas literas vel a limine salutaverit, ignorat hæc verba non minus, *Et verbum caro fuit, quam Et verbum caro factum est*, et bene et proprie verti posse." And to prove this, out of numberless examples, he says, he will only produce one, but I must say I think him not very happy in his choice. It is this, *Ὁς εγενετο ανηρ προφητης, δυνατος εργων και λογων*. Now, certainly if it were necessary that this passage should be rendered, "Who *was* a prophet," his inference might stand; but as it is just as proper to translate it, "Which man *became* a prophet, mighty in word and deed," it falls to the ground. I repeat my challenge; let a single instance be produced in which *εγενετο* is a mere copula, equivalent only to *ην*. Till that is done I shall regard the translation, "the *Word* was flesh," as false and inadmissible, and as involving the whole of this Socinian interpretation in the same predicament. With your permission, Mr. Editor, I shall shortly add some further observations on the same subject.

T. F. B.

SIR,

IT may gratify some of your readers, to be informed, that a substantial tomb has just been erected in Bunhill Fields, to the memory of the late Rev. and excellent Theophilus Lindsey. The expense was borne by the Rev. Mr. Belsham and a committee of gentlemen, consisting chiefly of his old friends, who justly admire his truly excellent character and exemplary virtues.

The following are the inscriptions on the tomb:

On the side,

In this vault reposes the Rev. THEOPHILUS LINDSEY, M. A., late of St. John's College in the University of Cambridge, and some time Vicar of Catterick, in Yorkshire. Having resigned his preferment in the Church for the sake of Truth and a good Conscience, he became the Founder of the Chapel in Essex Street. This venerable Confessor ended his blameless and exemplary life, 3rd day of November, MDCCCXIII. Aged LXXXVI.

On one end,

Mrs. HANNAH LINDSEY, relict of the late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, survived her venerable Consort little more than three years, and, full of hope and of good works, expired 18th January, MDCCCXII. aged LXXII.

On the other end,

Mrs. ELIZABETH RAYNER, nearly allied in blood to the illustrious house of Percy, esteemed it a still greater honour to be the friend and fellow-worshiper of Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, and by her own desire was deposited in the same grave. Mrs. Rayner died aged LXXXIV.

It is in contemplation to place a marble tablet with a longer inscription to his memory, in the Chapel in Essex Street, by the same gentlemen.

E. D.

SIR,

August 25, 1825.

I AM very much at a loss to know how to answer the modest demand of your correspondent I., (p. 403,) and to endeavour to set his mind at rest on the somewhat curious point, of a real Christian indulging great doubts of a miraculous agency in many of those facts, which the idiom of the Hebrew language, or rather that style of language which the writer adopted, has delivered to us in the character of miracle. I have been told that some

of your very serious and judicious readers have thought the piece signed W. intended for a burlesque upon Schiller, and not a serious allusion to the facts of the Old Testament: and, in my turn, I am labouring under the suspicion, that your correspondent I. is some infidel in disguise, who has thrown out a bait to catch another, by provoking him to farther remarks, when it is not in his power to call out the more able Schiller himself into the field. For it surely is now too late to use such language seriously, as your correspondent has employed on the subject of the historical parts of the Old Testament. What can he mean by these words, "I am at a loss to understand how those who call themselves Christians can justify such sceptical sentiments," &c.; and again, "inconsistent scepticism"? This is the common cant of ignorance—every thing is sceptical which is without the "exiguum curriculum" of our creed. I did not expect to see such a sentence in the *Repository of General Literature*. He must be dreaming when he talks of "striking at the very root of Christianity itself, and denying the divine authority of Moses and the prophets." In every step upwards, from the bare acknowledgment of Jesus as an extraordinary personage, to the belief in him as the everlasting God, the feeble child of dust talks of "the scepticism" of him who is moving one step below him, and "he cannot understand how he can call himself a Christian." I pity him from my heart! Serious as he may be, he will doubtless join in the exclamation of the witty author of the *Sentimental Journey*, "How I love the man, who will give up the reins into his author's hands, be pleased he knows not why, and cares not wherefore!!"

While it is not my design "to explain away all that appears miraculous," I have been taught by the example of Joseph Priestley, Henry Moore, and some other bold minds, who made their way of reading the Bible known to the world first in the *Theological Repository*, and afterwards in sundry works, to feel an anxiety to give an air of probability to all those ancient writings which, for various reasons, I hold in great esteem, and not the less so because there is an important relation acknow-

ledged between them and the books of the New Testament; which, in point of fact, are of infinitely greater value than they, and which might stand their ground, although the writings of Moses and the prophets had been trampled in the dust.

I fain would know whether your correspondent I., or whether any Unitarian Christian, is prepared to avow, that all the events of the Old Testament which are related in language that implies miracle, were really supernatural events? If he does, let him read Josephus's History of the Jews, and he will find that an orthodox Jew shews the natural agent that brought many of them about, and has not the most distant reference to miracle in them; nay, the Scriptures themselves, which in one place describe a transaction as the immediate work of God, in another describe the instrument to be a man or one of the powers of nature. I should fear affronting your biblical readers did I attempt to point them out.

And if I am disposed to assign natural causes for some other of those events which Christians have been pleased to regard as miraculous, am I to be called a sceptic and be bespattered with obloquy, and pointed at as an infidel and no Christian? The bigoted Catholic for that—who reproaches the man of "little faith," because he gives a false turn to the declaration of his Lord, "This is my body." The honest Trinitarian does the same, who denies the character of Christian to him who cannot believe in the personal divinity of the Son and the Spirit. And, if you please, the half-way Arian, who is angry with his younger brother, because he has taken one step beyond him, and denied the pre-existence of his Master.

On the ground of this "scepticism, which requires from your correspondent some farther explanation," let me refer I. to Bellamy's Bible, where I think he may be both amused and instructed, though he may not go all lengths with that erudite and ingenious writer. It is well known that the manner in which facts are spoken of in the Old Testament, has furnished a handle against the entire history of the Hebrews as a divine interference, and surely *he* cannot be a foe to divine truth who will remove the difficulties

that arise from modes of expression, although the result might be, that there were not so many miracles wrought by the Jewish Lawgiver as had been imagined; any more than *he* must be thought to do an injustice to the Christian system, who cannot discover a spiritual sense and a Christian meaning in the Song of Solomon. We have long ceased to believe that those infernal spirits, which Milton speaks of, so much like a poet, and so little like a believer, were driven out of the human body into the herd of swine; and that, in the temptation in the Garden of Eden, "Satan squat like a toad" at the ear of Eve, infusing his "wicked wiles," and indeed we make so free with the opinions of our fathers as to be satisfied that he had no concern in that woful temptation by which our first mother fell. We do even more than this, for we deny altogether that this drama of the fall of man, is the relation of a fact. And, whether or not we discern in it, as Schiller does, the first necessary operation of free-will, and regard it as a manifestation of man's independent state, and the almost unavoidable result of the condition in which he was placed, and therefore, in a strictly philosophical sense, no evil: by denying a fact which is so plainly declared, we certainly prepare the mind for a liberal interpretation of those relations which afterwards present themselves to our notice in the succeeding pages. I might as well believe that a serpent talked with Eve, as, that the wind breathed through the ram's horns, knocked down the walls of Jericho, when I can give a more reasonable account of both; I should have as little difficulty in admitting, that the Omnipresent Governor walked in the garden and met Adam, as one man may meet another, as, that Moses talked face to face with God, as a man may talk with his friend. But while I see in both a beautiful allusion to the agency of God, I admit no personal presence. There is a truth, Sir, in all these declarations; but I shall never believe God to be "altogether such an one as myself," and, therefore, interpret literally all those metaphorical expressions which are found in the Bible. All the powers of nature, and all the skill of man, are instruments in his hands of good and of evil to his crea-

tures; they are represented as engaged by him in an especial manner to train up a family for his worship; and a Jewish historian, when giving an account of what befel his people, goes back at once to the original cause, disregarding the minor instruments. Here has been the misfortune; because, although his statement is strictly true, and cannot be denied by him who "looks through nature up to nature's God;" yet they who confine their views to the act itself, may in many cases think the practice an absurd one, to ascribe to the Almighty the minutiae of laws, intended for so barbarous and wrong-headed a people as was that which left the Egyptian slavery in search of a better fate in some unknown land.

The letter of W. contains an allusion to the pillar of cloud and of fire; and I suspect the intimation that accompanied it terrified and shook the tender nerves of I. (if, as I still suspect, he be not as great a freethinker as myself). Now this is one of those historical facts which are as plain as a clear understanding can make them; and the very circumstance of such a phraseology being employed to describe what a profane author would give us in a simpler style affords a strong reason for us to carry a similar mode of interpretation into other parts of the Scripture history. For, as it is evident the persons for whom the Gospels were written did not believe that devils were driven out of the lunatics, but that the expression "possessed of demons," was the description of a certain disorder, as St. Vitus's dance and St. Anthony's fire are now among us, so the Jews in the time of Moses, or that in which the Pentateuch was written, whenever it might be, were not themselves deceived by the language of their sacred writers—it was left for Christians in the nineteenth century to add to the Mosaic history miracle upon miracle, and to spiritualize the plainest facts; until the angles of a box cannot be determined on, nor the trimmings of a curtain, without an express authority from Him who sways the sceptre of the universe, and gives laws to ten thousand worlds; and even the cherubims, the figures of two calves, and the space between them, a foot and a half, become the type of that boundless benevolence

and compassion, with which it is our delight to see our heavenly King invested. They who can delight in such puny thoughts are welcome to them; it will give me no concern to be charged by such persons with "inconsistent scepticism," though I think the adjunct might be taken away from this charge; for *they* only can be consistent who, while they believe the Supreme Being to be infinitely exalted above all blessing and praise, yet will assign him such paltry offices as many of those to which his agency is attained in a style of language chosen to suit the low conceptions of that small race of beings whose whole conduct, from the time they borrowed the jewels from their masters, to their dividing between them the rich land of Canaan, is a compound of ignorance, perverseness and rebellion. Yet they were not ignorant of what had been done for them, as many now seem to be, with all the aids of learning, and the lights which, in these latter days, have been thrown on the history of ancient times.

It is generally admitted among our biblical scholars, and it is a sentiment carried by some of them to a great length, that quotations from the Old Testament are made in the New, in order to shew a similarity of circumstances, and not a necessary connexion between the things spoken of. The respect in which the Christian writers held the Scriptures made them desirous of connecting the days of Christ with those of the earlier prophets; and where there they saw a similarity, or imagined a likeness, it was natural for them to point it out: and I suppose your correspondents are not ignorant that one highly respectable branch of the Unitarian public in England are not willing to admit even that many of those passages in the Old Testament, which have been generally thought to point to the Messiah, have any reference whatever to that great personage; they refuse to admit what to most are palpable prophetic declarations. And, will your correspondent I refuse them the character of Christians? But I must conclude.

W.

Pastoral Letter of Dr. Doyle's on Public Bible Discussions.

TO THE REVEREND THE CATHOLIC CLERGY IN CARLOW AND ITS VICINITY, WHO WERE HERETOFORE ENGAGED IN DISPUTES WITH CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

Reverend and dear Brethren,

I HAVE only heard of a challenge to dispute being published in *The Dublin Evening Post*, wherein certain members of the Bible Society, in Dublin, propose to meet some individuals of our clergy, in the presence of a select portion of the public, in order to discuss some question or questions previously agreed upon, and which are to relate, I suppose, to the religious belief of the parties to be thus engaged.

I need not remind you, dearest Brethren, of what is ruled by the Supreme Authority of the Church, (see Ben. xiv. de Syn. Dioc.,) with regard to individuals, unauthorized thereto by their Bishop, not entering into public disputations with persons maintaining heretical opinions; your own good sense, and the very nature of divine truth, as deposited by Christ with his Apostles and their successors, shew to you, that whatever relates to faith, morals or discipline, should be regulated by those whom the Holy Ghost has appointed to govern the Church. I, therefore, hearing of the above challenge, wishing to inform you, and all those concerned with you, that, having given to this matter, what consideration it deserves, it is my wish that no such disputation as is above mentioned be had by you, or by any of you, with the gentlemen alluded to!!!

As the obedience you owe to me is a reasonable one, it is just that I should state the grounds upon which I require of you to exercise it in this matter, and they are—First, because the character of the Christian religion is peace; and the end of it, to establish peace and good-will upon earth, as the means of fitting men for heaven; this end of our calling was announced by the Angels at Bethlehem, when the humanity and benignity of our Saviour God first appeared; and it was repeated by himself when he was about to leave us and return to

his Father, in these words :—" My peace I leave you, my peace I give you." To the establishment or preservation of this peace, the disputation mentioned would, in itself and in its effects, be directly opposed.

Second, St. Paul says, " If any one be contentious or fond of disputes, we have no such custom, nor the church of God." We would, therefore, deviate from the principles of God's church and the custom of the saints, as well as prove ourselves unmindful of the Apostle's suggestion, if we became fond of disputes.

Thirdly, because all experience has proved the justice and truth of Tertullian's remarks, in his book on " Prescription," wherein he says, that disputes with heretics weary the weak, create anxiety in the mind of others, and that the only thing we obtain by them is, to have our anger excited by their blasphemy. The reason assigned by him for this opinion is quite obvious; it is, that heretics despise authority which alone can determine disputes; that they disregard tradition, without which it is impossible to understand rightly that part of revelation which is written; and because they appeal to the Scriptures, which are mute, and cannot therefore decide. *In quibus (scripturis) incerta est victoria aut par incertæ.*

Fourthly, because no general principle, to which the questions to be discussed could be finally referred, can be agreed upon between the parties; for this reason, that the members of the Bible Society do not admit our creed, nor have they any creed of their own. They do not admit our creed, for they accuse the Church of having decreed error, and of having been sunk in idolatry, for upwards of eight hundred years: see the " Book of Homilies." They also have long misunderstood that universal article of the Christian faith, as expressed in the Nicene Creed, amplified in the First Council of Constantinople, and which says, " I believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church;" nay, there is reason to apprehend that they have latterly endeavoured, though unconsciously, to dissolve the entire religion of Christ into a system of Latitudinarianism, approaching to utter infidelity. They have no creed of their

own; for, from the reports of proceedings which, on a former occasion, took place between you and them, it appears that they maintained errors the most opposite one to the other; and that, being invited to produce a common formula of faith, they were unable to do so. It also appears, that, though some of these men nominally belong to the Established Church, they disregard her discipline and authority as it is laid down in the ordinance of the King, prefixed to the " Articles of Religion," as it is expressed or implied in the Articles themselves, and as it is recorded in the words of many of their Prelates; they do so by advocating an unlimited right for themselves and others to judge in all matters of religion, regardless of all authority. With such men there can be no common principles to which they could be bound to adhere; or, if there were any, they could be departed from by them as soon as their opinions underwent a change, but in no case would such principles express a form of religious belief binding upon others than those who might subscribe to them. You who are Catholics, professing a clearly defined faith, can never meet men who are thus tossed by every wind of doctrine, upon a footing of equality; they may be worsted in argument, convicted of error, confounded at the exposure of their own contradictions or folly, but they alone can suffer—no one is responsible for their errors, no person need blush at their confusion, no man is a partner in their shame; not so with you. If through error, mistake, ignorance or forgetfulness, you leave an objection unrefuted, or an aspersion not wiped away, such objection or aspersion stands recorded against your church, and the chaste spouse of Christ suffers in your person from the blasphemy of her apostate children.

Fifthly, you are to avoid these disputes, because by entering into them you appear to call in question those truths which are already defined by the Holy Ghost and by us; that is, by the Bishops, the successors of the Apostles. You agree, as it were, to impanel a jury, of I know not what description of persons, to try the question whether Christ is with us teach-

ing all days, even to the end of the world; whether the Holy Ghost has, or has not, taught our fathers all truth;—whether we be placed by him to rule the church of God;—whether this church be, or be not, the pillar and ground of truth;—whether those whom we leave bound on earth be bound in heaven, or whether the gates of hell have, or can prevail against the church; whether, again, this church has been buried in idolatry for eight hundred years; whether, in fine, those who refuse to hear her, and who thereby despise Christ and the Father who sent him, are, or are not, as heathens and publicans before God. The truths, Rev. Brethren, which would be thus subjected, as it were, to trial, are clear and incontestible; you yourselves have enforced them by much argument and eloquence; and it is because they are immovable, and because your arguments in support of them are able, convincing and unanswerable, that the members of the Bible Society wish, by inviting you to a renewed discussion, to turn public attention from the palpable folly of their proceedings—from the unspeakable evils which the principles they advocate have entailed upon society; from the frauds and impositions practised by persons connected with them; but, above all, from the contemplation of that worst of all evils, the introduction and justification of Socinianism or infidelity; evils which flow immediately and necessarily from the recognition of an unlimited right in all persons to discard authority, and to abide in religious matters by the single opinion of their own mind. No! Brethren, you have supplied to society at large, ample materials for serious and deep reflection; suffer men to digest them, to reflect upon them, and should error or heresy approach again to our borders, you will know how, and where, and when to repel it, lest it should creep like a cancer among our people.

Sixthly, you should not dispute with these men in the manner proposed, because there is no tribunal on the earth competent to try the issue between you. The errors maintained by the members of the Bible Society regard either the primary articles of the Christian faith or truths already defined by the Church. Both these

classes of truths are immovably and definitively settled; God or his church, or rather both, have spoken; and as St. Augustine said to the Pelagians, "The cause is concluded, I wish the error would at length cease," *causa finita est, utinam aliquando finiretur error*. There can be no new hearing, no new trial. The Church at Trent invited the heretics of the 16th century (those who broached or renewed the errors which are now revived) to plead their own cause before the Council; these blind and obstinate men refused to do so, but their cause was examined fully and dispassionately—sentence at length was passed, and the matter set at rest for ever. *Causa finita est*. It can never be revived: it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to our fathers so to determine: there can be no rehearing of the case; there is no higher tribunal constituted by God, no one or many to whom a new issue could be directed for trial; "Whosoever does not hear the Church, let him be as an heathen and a publican." Those who are cut off on account of their obstinacy may complain, but there is no remedy for them but in submission; the Church may soothe, may explain; she may relax or alter her discipline to favour their weakness or to assist them to return; but the one faith she cannot alter; it is as simple, as immutable, as God himself! You, Rev. Brethren, have often and well proved these truths; one argument alone is sufficient, "Going," says the Redeemer to his Apostles, and, in their persons, to those who lawfully succeed to them, "Going, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, commanding them to observe whatsoever I have given you in command, and lo! I am with you till the end of the world." It is the worst of heresy, and a virtual apostacy from the Christian religion, to assert that there ever was, or will be wanting, a body of men assisted immediately by Christ, and employed without interruption or intermission in administering the Sacraments of God, teaching his commandments, and ruling throughout the world his one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. It is the worst of heresy, and a virtual apostacy from the Christian religion, to assert that

the gates of hell have ever prevailed against this Church, that is, that the pastors and people who compose it have ever, at any period, even for a single hour, professed error! You, therefore, cannot enter into a disputation which would seem to imply that the opposite of what is here stated is even remotely possible!

Lastly, you should not contend, as it is proposed, with men, over whom a triumph could be productive of no permanent advantage; as individuals they may be learned and respectable, but as religionists they are deserving only of your unmixed pity. They profess to be seeking for truth—this can only be found in the Catholic Church; and the faith that believes in it, as there propounded, is a gift of God—to be obtained, not by disputation, but by humility, alms-deeds and prayer. The judgment of man is too slow, and too unsettled—the objects of its investigation are too mysterious and too far removed—it may reason interminably and dispute, but it can never determine; authority alone can decide. “By the sun alone of the Church,” as Jerome observes, “all the streams or rivulets of error can be dried up.” To ascertain the existence of this Church—for the infidel, signs and tongues may be necessary; for a Christian the grace of his baptism, and the creed which he has learned at his mother’s breast, is quite sufficient: and to such at least as are born and educated in these countries, it must be quite obvious, if they be humble, pious, dispassionate, and not maddened with enthusiasm, that no sect or denomination of Christians existing in it (the Catholics alone excepted) have not separated themselves from the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church at a certain time, and for causes but too well ascertained; and as to the consequences of such a separation, it is not mine, whilst addressing you, to state them, or to give expression to that deep affliction which the consideration of them excites within me. I once was moved by such reflections, and by the love I bear to my brethren who are in error, (for whom like the Apostle, I would willingly, for a time, be even an Anathema, or separated from Christ,) to suggest, through an eminent individual, not to a society, not to ladies and gen-

tlewomen, but to one of the highest states in the realm, a proposal for seeking to bind up that which has been broken; to heal that which is infirm, and to bring back that which has strayed; but the spirit which was once sent to seduce Achab, has been permitted to seduce many in this empire, and the term of his seduction has not yet expired; perhaps it will yet terminate; if it should, the means of conciliation and peace are at hand; if not, it is our duty to adore the counsels of that God, whose judgments are inscrutable, and whose ways cannot be investigated.

Praying the Almighty God, Rev. Brethren, that he may keep our minds and hearts united in his love, and in the love of one another,

I remain your truly affectionate and humble servant in Jesus Christ.

† J. DOYLE.

Given at Edenderry, on my Visitation, this 28th day of August, 1825.

Stockton-on-Tees,
Sept. 8, 1825.

SIR,

IT gives me and my friends in this place great pleasure to learn, from the last number of the Repository, that an Unitarian interest is on the eve of being established in a neighbouring town. There are but two Unitarian congregations in the county of Durham, one at Stockton, and the other at Sunderland, both of which are small. The members of the former (and especially one who is now no more, but whose praise is, and will long remain, in the church in which he was a very distinguished ornament) have often regretted that circumstances have hitherto been unfavourable to the introduction of Unitarianism into other towns in the county.

We are a little surprised that your Durham correspondent, and his Unitarian friends, after long regretting that some place has not hitherto been appropriated to Unitarian worship, should not have sought the co-operation of the Unitarians at Stockton, or at least of that very judicious advocate of our cause, the Rev. Mr. Turner, of Newcastle. If Philo-Unitas is earnestly desirous of seeing his wishes accomplished, I beg to offer my humble services, and to assure him, that

every assistance in my power, will be cheerfully given; and I do not doubt that he may look with confidence for the best advice and most efficient assistance from my friend Mr. Turner.

If the room can be procured which your correspondent mentions, I hope there will be no great difficulty of obtaining supplies for a time. I believe I may venture to say, that my flock will, now and then, spare me a sabbath, for the purpose of visiting Durham, if my services should be acceptable.

As the mind is not easily roused from the torpor of indifference, Philo-Unitas would do well to procure some two or three sermons of the Rev. R. Cree's of Preston, and circulate them amongst his friends, the title of which is, "Indifference to the Cause of Truth worse than Infidelity." This discourse is moderate, sensible, and judicious; and is well calculated to awaken from the sleep of indifference. I shall be very glad however to learn, that no stimulus of this kind is needed; but that the Durham Unitarians have already "counted the cost," and find that they have sufficient decision, zeal, and perseverance, to build themselves up "together for a habitation of God" the Father, "through the spirit."

Philo-Unitas, at the close of his communication, speaks rather uncourteously of extempore prayer, and for no other reason, that I can discover, than that he has had bad specimens of it from orthodox preachers, some of whom, in their public devotions, it must be confessed, are in the habit of making long and rambling digressions. But before he indulges in reflections upon extempore prayer in general, let him first hear how public prayer is conducted by Unitarian ministers, who, if he leave them to adopt their own plan, will probably not often offend him by extempore prayer, as they mostly use precomposed prayers.

J. C. MEEKE.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for September, 1824.

MR. BAKEWELL IN REPLY
TO DR. SMITH. Little, probably, did Dr. Smith expect an antagonist of this description. We have here a counter-authority to his own

VOL. XX.

4 A

on several points, respecting which our information could only rest upon private assertion. I am gratified at finding that many of my former reflections, suggested by a perusal of Mr. Smith's letters, coincide with the remarks here made by so calm, and, I presume, respectable an observer.

Dr. Smith's Reply to Chenevière, &c. Rambling. What kind of a "reply" to M. C. are the two columns entitled M. Curtat? As I have proceeded along through this spontaneous defence, I have been more and more amazed at its weakness. Can this Dr. Smith be the man, whose attacks your English Unitarians think it worth while formally to rebut? After arriving at the last word of this series, I cannot say that I have any materially different impressions of the whole case, from those with which I concluded the perusal of M. Chenevière's defence.

Notes on Passages of Scripture. In general excellent. Perhaps rather too refined in the remarks about *anger*. I imagine St. Paul only referred to different degrees of that emotion. There is an innocent, (not to say necessary and useful,) and there is a sinful degree of it. To the former I suppose the Apostle alluded, when he bade the Ephesians to be angry and sin not, and to let not the sun go down upon their wrath. Afterwards, in enumerating and prohibiting several of the highly malignant passions, he says, Let all bitterness, and wrath, and *anger*, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice. That is, such a violent and unrestrained indulgence of anger, as may well be classed among those other evils and affections. Our annotator's criticisms on Hallet's remark respecting the word anger in the New Testament, are loose and little to the point. One word more. Several of his conclusions have a decided squinting at controversy, notwithstanding the disclaimer in his luscious motto from Bacon.

Brevis—and I may add, *et Suavis*. Do I not recognise in this pithy, earnest, yet occasionally playful contributor, my old friend "Unitarian" of the Correspondence? Why does he not stick to *terms*? He is strictly an Universalist, rather than an Unitarian.

Mr. E. Cogan on Bishop Burgess's Uncharitableness. Exactly to the point.

G. B. W. on the Papers of Philadelphus. An acute and sensible writer. How will the logical skill of Philadelphus enable him to elude the corner into which his mild opponent has here fastened him with several pins? The high, solemn and rational strain, which marks the last half of this communication, expresses, though in a far better manner, several sentiments, which I have occasionally tried to urge upon your letter-writer, "The Unitarian."

Ancient Use of the Word Worship. A good point of criticism is here made to bear on a subject, which, as much as any other that can be named, contributes to retaining the belief of the Trinity in the popular mind. Let *worship* be exchanged in our translation for *reverence*, *Lord* for *Sir* or *Master*, and a few more such terms be replaced in a similar manner, whenever it is strictly and grammatically proper so to do, and what a mighty subsidiary aid would be torn away from the imaginations of the vulgar in favour of orthodoxy, to which she has now no sort of right, even if she be identical with the truth itself! A vast majority, I fear, even of the most candid Trinitarians, who possess learning and intelligence, are guilty of no little subterfuge, in slyly permitting the accidental influence of such mistranslations to exert an unwarrantable effect over their ignorant followers.

A Calvinist has my full sympathy in his remarks on the Satiric Fragment. But without pretending to the adequate character of that "equitable censor," who, a Calvinist says, is wanting in the pages of the Repository, I must aver, that his expostulations with Mr. Worsley do not appear to be well-founded. If *moral inability* signify nothing more than *disinclination*, why persist in using a term so constantly liable to be misapprehended and misused by carping adversaries? Be assured, this Calvinist deceives himself. A great portion of his party mean much more by *moral inability* than *disinclination*, notwithstanding a few of them, when pushed up to consequences, or desirous of defending a favourite system by mere verbal inge-

nuity, contrive to explain away its offensive peculiarities. No. There is something congenial with the Calvinistic system in the sterner literal notion of moral inability, which its advocates at large inculcate. It is of a piece with all those other huge, unnatural, astounding doctrines, at which reason stands aghast, but which the general desire after "aliquid immensum et infinitum," causes to be quietly swallowed down by a childish faith and a dazzled imagination. Like the doctrines of the Trinity and orthodox atonement, there is an imposing mystery and magnitude in the thing. There is a sweet consciousness of distinction, and a sweeter sense of sanctified merit, in being able to prevail upon one's mind to yield assent to impossible propositions, which the world in general refuse to receive. Disinclination, forsooth! If all evangelical preachers would but use this very smooth, soft and inoffensive term, and would only tell their sinful hearers, that they have no *inclination* to serve God, &c., wherein would they differ from Arminians and Unitarians? If Dr. J. P. Smith's authority is to be relied on, it was by such conceivable, such insidious explanations, that the Ostervalds and the later Turretins frittered away the whole rough form of ancient Calvinism, and reduced the centre of Europe to a hideous moral darkness exactly proportioned to the clearness with which religious subjects are contemplated.

Εξετασθη on the Unitarian Scheme of Atonement. I will contribute my feeble answers to this Inquirer according to the order of his interrogatories.

1. Unitarians regard the death of Christ as an evil, ordained or permitted to bring about, by its indirect effects, an infinitely greater good. Hence, there is no "injustice" in this disposition of Providence, on the long scale, particularly when we remember the "joy which was set before" Christ, and the vast preponderating rewards which he himself obtained for his obedience. Whereas, this writer allows, and with propriety too, that the orthodox view of Christ's death is "directly opposed to all ideas of justice." Moreover, is there not a difference, not only in "degree," but in *essence*, between God's

"permitting" a *voluntary* sacrifice for the *benefit* of others, and "requiring" an innocent person to suffer *before the guilty can be pardoned*? To me it appears that these two propositions cannot be compared together; they are not homogeneous. I find not a single point which they have in common. I am more puzzled to feel the force of the writer's statement than to answer it. When I contemplate the first proposition, I feel a moral generous glow of sympathy, both with the Deity and with the sufferer. In looking at the latter proposition, I feel only a sensation of shuddering abhorrence. And that is all the account I can give of the matter.

2. In the supposed *vicarious sufferings* which this writer and Dr. Butler see in the moral government of the world, they have, unfortunately for their argument, seized upon an *exception*, instead of a *general rule*. In arguing from the analogy of nature, as to the proper character of Christ's death, we must ask, not what happens "in many cases," or merely in "a variety of ways"—but what is the general principle on which the Deity seems to conduct his moral government. And, surely, no one can say that he *generally* punishes vice in this world by inflicting pain on the innocent. See, then, the advantage which the Unitarian has in appealing to the analogy of nature. His first glance at it sweeps away the orthodox doctrine of atonement. And as he looks a little farther, he finds his own view of it confirmed. Because, *GENERALLY*, whenever he sees pain and suffering in this world, he sees a long train of good effects to be more or less connected with it, precisely in the way in which he himself connects the benefits of Christ's death with that painful event. It is not till he looks much farther, and finds, by the exercise of his ingenuity, a few *anomalous* cases of vicarious suffering, that he perceives any thing which can even remotely excuse the violent and unnatural doctrine of a literal sacrifice in lieu of the guilty human race. I trust I have here pointed out a fallacy, or at least a frailty in one part of Dr. Butler's excellent work. Whenever he fortifies religious truths by an appeal to the general analogy of nature, I think the argument is unexceptionable and

successful. But with regard to the atonement, he had it not in his power to do that; he could adroitly appeal to *occasional exceptions* in the course of nature, which, in truth, when properly considered, instead of confirming, only overthrow the doctrine they are advanced to establish. An opponent always has it in his power to say, and to say fairly, If you can prove *your* opinion, by referring to what the Deity *sometimes*, or "in many cases" performs in the course of nature, *my* opinion, even on your own principle, is so much the dearer and stronger to me; because it is analogous to what the Deity *almost always*, and in a great *majority* of cases is constantly producing.

3. The subjection to pain and death of the whole animal creation, is not, I think, a "similar anomaly" to the orthodox doctrine of the atonement. It might be easily shewn that the former law of Providence, produces, on the whole, the greatest quantity of happiness throughout the sensitive creation, while, at the same time, it certainly violates no *moral propriety*. Whereas, Unitarians profess to see in the orthodox opinion of the atonement, not merely the suffering and death of an innocent person, but such an application of it, as, when fairly reduced to its legitimate consequences, confounds all moral notions whatever. No one can say, that the sufferings of the animal creation take away the *guilt* incurred by some order of responsible beings in another quarter of the universe. But it could evidently be only *such* an analogy, that would give strength to the inquirer's third objection. We are too apt, in drawing analogies, to confine our attention to some single common circumstance between the objects of comparison, when, on a little nicer examination, other circumstances may be discovered, which utterly destroy the supposed relation.

Apology for joining in the Church Service. Very well—very well indeed. It is a pity that so much can be also said on the other side.

Extracts from Ancient Presbyterian Registers. There seem to be many marks here of the word *Ichabod* having been written on the Presbyterian Church of England at the time to which the extracts refer.

Mr. Haldane's Letter to Dr. Smith.

It is unfortunate for the general credibility of Mr. Smith's paintings, lately communicated to the Repository, that his friend Mr. Haldane has detected so glaring a mistake; and remarkable, that he found nothing particularly to confirm, except the denial of M. Chenevière's surmise regarding a concerted plan to revolutionize the Genevan Church. Even on this point, all that Mr. Haldane declares is, that there was no *previously* concerted plan before he went abroad. The Professor's charge might fairly be interpreted as only a general one, but fully borne out by all the facts and circumstances. I presume he did not intend to convey the idea that there was an organized and specific conspiracy among the orthodox of different countries to effect the purpose in question, but only such a general sympathy and implicit understanding among persons of great zeal, as would induce them to co-operate whenever opportunity and prospects of success presented themselves. His expression was rather pointed, it is true; but the expressions of an earnest, irritated man, though descriptive of the truth, frequently vibrate somewhat from the line of logical precision. Do, Mr. Smith, let us forgive M. Chenevière a little hyberbole.

Persecution of Elias Hickey. It is a singular instance of the advantages attendant on the active diffusion of literature and commerce, that the first information which I received respecting this outrageous business arrived through the medium of the Monthly Repository, printed in London.

Verus on Sunday Schools. I am happy to find that Verus is acquainted with so many facts that tend to rebut the discouraging statements of his opponent. But he is better in marshalling facts, than in pursuing nice verbal reasonings. A Friend to Sunday-Schools did not mean that the very identical persons who neglect the education of the youthful poor, take positive pains at the same time, to give them an improper education. He could only mean to instance two separate faults, one of which could be charged to some Unitarians, and the other to others. So that there is no "inconsistency on the face of his charge." Again. Verus snatches at the word *purity*, and pretends to give for its exact correlative

the word *impure*. But the very mention of this last epithet implies an immoral and disgusting quality, far disproportioned to what the Friend of Sunday Schools could mean by asserting that Unitarians neglected the purity of education.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository. The Editor was fearful, it seems, of being suspected of a "stratagem" in my communications. Whereby, I presume, he has whispered to the public some of the secrets of his laboratory.

I have no particular criticism to make on this paper, except that the sentence, "Mr. Rutt's Remarks on Anonymous Signatures is very sensible and well-timed," seems somewhat objectionable in point of grammar.

Mr. Worsley in Reply to Corrector. I remember, that on reading the remarks of Mr. Worsley's censor, I thought he must have used an inconsiderate latitude, in charging him with being "erroneous in every particular."

REVIEW.—1. *Ben David.* To say the least, these arguments of Dr. Jones's in favour of the Christianity of Philo and Josephus, are very imposing, and set one into a train of wistful meditation. Among many Christians in this country, in part, too, of a class below the middling, Josephus is a great favourite. They read him next to their Bibles. Why does Dr. Jones depart from the conclusions of Sir Isaac Newton and Griesbach, with respect to the authenticity of *Θω*, in 1 Tim. iii. 16?

2. *On the recent Prosecutions, &c.* The second paragraph of this article is a happy specimen of what I wish to see in such a *Catalogue Raisonné* of new books, as I intimated in a former synopsis. The extract is noble—has a tinge of sublimity in consequence of conforming to, and relying on, the grand simplicity of truth.

3. *A Funeral Discourse, by J. Johns.* There are indeed some sweet notes in the epicedium, from which the Reviewer here exhibits specimens. They are beautiful and affecting:—but have not quite, as I apprehend, that majestic and energetic movement, that stamen of argument, that directness of attainable object, which would entitle them very decisively to the praise of "eloquence." But it is

no easy thing to define poetry and eloquence respectively.

4. *Dr. Evans's Richmond.* The anecdote here told of the clergyman who declined the parish of Richmond, may be an evidence of his "contentment," but whether his humility is so apparent from his complacent certainty of at last arriving at Lambeth, is more questionable.

Perhaps we ought not to scrutinize too closely the metaphysics of a poetess; but some expressions in Miss Aikin's lines on Wakefield, might be interpreted as indicative of Materialism. She speaks of a *mind*, and a high undaunted *soul*, *mouldering* in earth. Wakefield himself might have been pleased with such a doctrine, in connexion with his belief in the resurrection. Probably, however, his fair eulogist intended nothing more than a poetical licence—a kind of inverted prosopopeia.—What can be more exquisite than the closing couplet? There is a misprint, in one of the preceding lines, of *tears* for *eyes*.

I was lately very much astonished at learning from a gross and ill-natured communication in Blackwood's Magazine, that Wakefield seriously undertook to comment upon Pope's Verses by a Person of Quality. Were it not for the habitual gravity of the deceased critic's character, I should almost regard his attempt only as a *jeu d'esprit*, whimsically adapted to the nature of the verses.

5. *Bourn's Gazetteer.* The population of Boston has now advanced to 50,000 within the city-bounds. The small number assigned by Morse, for 1792, astonishes me. I have heard President Adams say, that in the time of the American Revolution, it seemed to have as many inhabitants as during the late war. But Morse must undoubtedly have used authentic documents.

POETRY.—*On the Death of Mrs. George Kenrick.* If it were not sacrilegious, as well as literary presumption, to meddle with these polished tears, I would recommend a slight modification of the very first line. The repetition of the double iambic, which, in the beginning of some small pieces of Byron, *Bowering* and others, was so striking a beauty, now rather falls upon my ear with its staleness. For my own private taste, therefore,

I could have wished some apostrophe substituted in the place of the initial clause. Other critical reasons occur to me for the alteration, but there are probably still stronger reasons why I should distrust them.

Paraphrase of Thomson's Hymn exhibits good powers of versification, and the not small merit of remodeling a composition like Thomson's Hymn without spoiling it. The printer, I suppose, has converted "its resistless" or "a resistless" into "irresistless."

Could a more pleasing and impressive volume be compiled than The Poetry of the Monthly Repository? I think it would be a highly acceptable gift to the literary and religious public. It would certainly be valuable in one point of view, viz. as demonstrating that Unitarianism is neither unfavourable to the head nor the heart,—that it neither repels the illapses of poetical inspiration, nor jeopardises the truth and purity of literary taste, nor represses a high moral enthusiasm, nor checks the growth and outbursts of a fervent piety. The Editor would not, of course, feel constrained to reprint every thing indiscriminately, which he should find in the archives of his poetical department. The approaching close of the twentieth volume seems to present a happy era for the execution of such a project. It may be that there is already poetry enough to fill two portly volumes, and that ten years would in general be a convenient cycle for the revolution and reappearance of the phenomenon proposed. The very influence of such an established, continuous arrangement on the subsequent effusions of contributors to the Repository would be felicitous. Biographical notices might be added of some of the deceased, and perhaps also of some of the living tuneful correspondents.

Lines written at Sunset. The locality and character of these lines would seem to justify one in ascribing them to the author of the Funeral Discourse, reviewed in the present number. Besides overflowing with poetry, they possess also, I think, that peculiar afflatus which constitutes eloquence, to a greater degree than the discourse.

The selected *Ballad* is pretty.

Obituary. I know not why a biographical essay on persons recently deceased should not find a place now and then among the leading articles in the Repository.

Intelligence. The accounts of the formation of two new Unitarian Associations in England are auspicious. Let the whole body of liberal Christians throughout the realm, and even throughout the world, be duly organized, and, in spite of occasional delay, or local decline, the time must sooner or later come, when a prodigious movement will take place in the progress of the cause.

Sept. 7th.

FASHION, Mr. Editor, governs every thing; even religion in some degree bends to it. Some chapels and some preachers are more fashionable than others. And there now seems to be an inclination with certain Unitarians to make Ordination Services fashionable among them. Not being myself a man of fashion, Sir, I am somewhat eagle-eyed as to its freaks, and I beg a little space in your next number, in which to express my present want of inclination to acquiesce in the fashion of having an Ordination Service introduced into the economy of our chapels.

Some years since, with a view of forming my own religious opinions, I read with no small attention the New Testament; and the result of that study was, that ordination was a service with which we, in these latter days, have no concern. The laying on of the hands, in apostolic times, was clearly for the purpose of conferring some spiritual gift; and the texts, therefore, which Mr. Baker has referred to, in support of the practice, are perfectly beside the question, considered as authority for a modern Ordination.

Your correspondent Spectator (p. 477) says, that "Mr. Baker has judiciously placed its defence upon the strong ground of utility, which in itself is sufficient for any observance." Now, Sir, hardly as it may seem, I am inclined to dispute this position. If there be a direction in scripture, whose utility we do not perceive, we may and ought to acquiesce in it; because we may be fully assured, that the Divine Appointer knows, better

than we do, what is right. If such a direction coincide with our ideas of utility, we may have great satisfaction in the observance of it. But *utility alone* appears to me to be tender ground on which to rest the question. In the estimation of some people, the gown may be introduced into our chapels, on the score of utility, and also many of the imposing ceremonies of the Romish church. Many a devotee has, upon the ground of utility, fasted and flogged himself. Is Mr. Baker thus ready to mortify his body for the sin of his soul?

But admitting for a moment utility as a ground of argument, what is the utility pointed out as appertaining to these Ordination Services? "It is one advantage of these services, (says your correspondent who sent you the account of Mr. Tagart's settlement at Norwich, p. 500), that the congregation has an opportunity of hearing from a mutual friend what are their duties to their minister. From a young man especially, just entering upon the ministry, it would seem presumptuous and unbecoming to address his people on these topics." "Mr. Fox's aim," we are further told in his eloquent address, "was to shew in what way the labourer whom the congregation had chosen ought to receive his reward." His design was very good; but before we come to the conclusion, that "it is not too much to expect that great permanent good will result from a discourse so full of excellent advice," we may ask, Did the people of Norwich want such advice? Have they not been in the habit of idolizing their minister? And we may further ask, Are they more disposed to reward Mr. Tagart than they were when they decided on inviting him, and on what salary they should give him for his services? If any one, instead of his ten guineas has subscribed his twenty toward the Octagon, then we should have some tangible proof that in his case Mr. Fox had not poured forth his eloquence in vain. The truth of the matter is, that people go to hear sermons, not to receive "permanent good" from them; but, *pour passer le tems*, they fix in their own minds what they will give to a charity before they have heard the sermon in its behalf, and they have made up their minds how they

will treat their minister, before they have heard the address of the officiating preacher.

Spectator says, that Mr. Turner, in his address to the students at York, expressed his gratification "at learning that it was their general intention to solicit the advice of their Elders respecting their conduct as ministers of the gospel." If Mr. Turner referred here to Ordination Services, I can only say that the time when these take place, does not appear to me to be the proper time for such advice being given. This advice should be given them when they *first turn their thoughts* to the ministry, before they have *determined* on being ministers. It is at *this time* they should have impressed on their minds what they would have to do, and what difficulties they would have to encounter. When Mr. Turner or Mr. Any One in the capacity of tutor of an academy has recommended a young man to a congregation, the recommendation itself is a pledge that he *is qualified* to undertake the charge from *his having had all needful study and advice*; and for any one afterward to mount the pulpit, and, as it is said, deliver a charge, seems to me to be a great piece of mummery.

Backed as he is by the direction of Scripture, how can there be any thing in the range of Christian duty that it can be "unbecoming and presumptuous" for a young man to advert to? If there be any thing of this kind, it must be on account of the *youth* of the young man. But if this juvenility be an evil, the old fathers in the pulpit should go round at *stated periods* to remedy this evil, and to inform the churches; else, for ten or a dozen years, that is, till a minister gain the weight and experience that thirty or thirty-five years in the world will confer, the assembly would be lacking that advice which it is "presumptuous" for young men to offer. I own, Sir, that I think the circumstance that our congregations are committed to the care of such young men, as have been lately chosen sole pastors, is a very great evil. They may be respectable for their behaviour and talents, but they cannot command that respect which older men can do; they cannot have the same weight. I attribute to this source the defici-

ency of *devotional* spirit, which has been charged, and not altogether without reason, on the Unitarian body. I am not aware that we can remedy this evil; but I am quite clear Ordination Services will not effect it.

It perhaps is maintainable, that this deficiency of devotional spirit may arise from the increase of knowledge. When the apostles lived, they delivered to men a new discovery, that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself;" a discovery this, which had been in the first instance committed to them only. During successive ages, the clergy were the only persons possessed of learning: the communication of their knowledge was a link of attraction between them and the people; and if they were pious, or enthusiasts, or devotees, as many were, the people insensibly, from endearment, caught their manners and feelings. *Now*, congregations know as much as their ministers: they come to sit in judgment on them, quite as much as to be led by their judgment. This after all may, Sir, in the unscrutable workings of Providence, be preparatory and necessary to the establishment on earth of that general mental illumination and correct feeling, which will render it needless for us to have ministers to say to any, "Know the Lord, but when all shall know him, from the least unto the greatest."

May I, before I conclude, Sir, allude briefly to another subject, which, by adverting to more than one object, may seem like reviewing your miscellany. As, however, you think it right to let an American do this, you will perhaps permit an Englishman to do the same. I agree with your correspondent E, that it is highly desirable to circulate tracts; and the plan proposed by that writer, I should think, is very practicable. But I cannot confine it to *American* tracts. They are very excellent in their way, I allow; but they are not equal to the sermons of our own ministers, when *our* wants are considered. They are too much of the old Unitarian, or Arian stamp. Doctrines are too much kept out of sight in them, at least in those which have fallen into my hands. As the *union* of piety and morality makes the perfect Christian, so I conceive the union of

doctrine and precept makes the perfect sermon; and we have enough of these at home, without importations.

C.

SIR, *Aug. 20th, 1825.*

NO speculative doctrine perhaps has been more frequently misunderstood, and more grossly perverted, than that of *philosophical necessity*. By the generality of persons, and even by those who pride themselves on the superiority of their intellectual faculties, it is at once, without reasoning on the subject, pronounced to be devoid of foundation; while by another class, though confessing their inability to answer the arguments in its favour, it is not less vehemently condemned, on account of the supposed consequences to which its admission would give rise. Two of the latest publications on this contested point have been written by eminent members of our two English Universities. The "Essay on Human Liberty," by Dr. Milner, the late President of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Dean of Carlisle, is one of the most impartial, and, at the same time, one of the clearest and best written argumentative treatises to be found in the language. Nothing can be fairer than the statement of the arguments on both sides of the question; and nothing can, generally speaking, be more conclusive than the reasoning in favour of the *necessarian* doctrine. I certainly cannot speak in the same terms of the other publication to which I allude, entitled "An Inquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination in Four Discourses, &c.," by Dr. Copleston, the present Provost of Oriel College, in the sister university. The author is unquestionably a man of great learning and talent, and has evinced a degree of versatility in their application not very frequently witnessed. Classical criticism, political economy, and metaphysics, which have obviously no intimate relation to each other, have all exercised this writer's skill, though with very far from equal success. In this last work, however, he is considered by his admirers at Oxford and at Edinburgh, as meriting the thanks of every friend to religion, and as having treated the subject in a masterly manner. From this opinion

I differ most widely; and I think that his reasoning can afford satisfaction to no one who is really acquainted with the topic in controversy. Dr. Copleston does not attempt to invalidate the *direct* proof of the doctrine he disputes, but denies its truth from *two consequences*, which he imagines would inevitably follow from its general adoption. On the supposition of its truth, he affirms that motives would cease to operate, and *inactivity* would universally prevail. This constitutes his first objection. The second consequence which he deduces from it, and which, if well founded, would justly excite still greater alarm, is the *extinction of all moral principle*. And since (he proceeds to argue) the necessarian himself admits that to effect the belief of this doctrine, considerable exercise and improvement of reason are required, his theory involves this absurdity, that in exact proportion as our understandings are strengthened and improved, all the ends and purposes of our being would be counteracted.* The learned author regards this method of reasoning as differing from any hitherto adopted, but as both of the objections on which his argument is founded have been repeatedly advanced, I can perceive no semblance of novelty, except perhaps in the form which he has given to his conclusion. Though, like many who have preceded him in the same path, he has completely failed in establishing the positions on which his inference depends, it may be useful to observe the method he has pursued in persuading himself that he has proved his point.

He maintains, that if men were really convinced that every thing in the universe is fixed and preordained, they would soon cease to act, and would consider every effort as a fruitless attempt to alter the course of nature. The two grand motives of hope and fear, he avers, could no longer operate, and mankind would desist from exerting their faculties as soon as they entertained a belief that whether they were indolent or active, the order of things would remain the same. But, in point of fact, he asserts that those who profess to hold

* Dis. II. p. 47.

these tenets do not conform to them ; and that necessarians and fatalists act in the common affairs of life precisely like libertarians, and consequently in opposition to the theory they have undertaken to defend. Hence Dr. C. infers, that " upon the hypothesis of *fatalism*, every step we advance in knowledge we recede from utility, and in the same proportion as we become wiser, we become less fit and less disposed to fulfil the purposes of our being."

In the first place, this writer confounds the doctrine of *Necessity*, as it is explained by its ablest modern advocates, with that of *Fatalism*, which so commonly prevailed among the ancients, and is still professed by the followers of Mahomet. As far, however, as his reasoning is applied to the former, I have no hesitation in calling it mistaken and nugatory. From the confidence reposed by the learned preacher in the objections he has urged, we might almost infer that they had never been answered. Why, I would ask, are we to suppose that the foreknowledge of the Deity must interfere with the activity of man? For, admitting the events of futurity to be pre-ordained by infinite wisdom, yet to us they are contingent;—not contingent in an absolute sense, because we contend that what is foreseen is inevitably fixed; but they are so concealed from our confined views, and limited faculties, that we are unable to decide which among the possible incidents of human life will actually take place. That one of two opposite events will happen is certain; but as a human agent is entirely ignorant which of them is predetermined, that circumstance ought not to affect the formation of his plans: and since he must have observed that he who employs the *means* is more likely to secure the *end* than he who neglects them, it would evidently be the height of folly to remain inactive. The Mahometan, when he rushes to battle, believes, and in my apprehension rightly believes, that his fate is fixed beforehand; but as he cannot absolutely know what that fate will be, and as experience might have taught him, that the man who avoids unnecessary danger has a better prospect of escaping than he who is indifferent about the matter, he ought

to perceive the absurdity of not using every mode of self-defence consistent with duty and honour. In the case of shipwreck, though it is pre-ordained beyond all doubt which part of the crew will be saved, and which will not, does the persuasion of this truth justify inertness, or does it render the exertions of every individual for self-preservation in the slightest degree less requisite? The creed of the necessarians, when properly understood, inculcates no such practice. On the contrary, it condemns inactivity and despondency, not merely in situations of peril, but in any circumstances, as alike hostile to our present and our future welfare, and as inconsistent with the fundamental principles on which the doctrine is founded. No change in the physical world can take place without an adequate cause; and no wish or design formed in the human mind can be accomplished without the adoption of active means.

With respect to the other leading objection against *Necessity*, that it must be destructive of all accountability and moral principle, Dr. Copleston, like most other writers on the same side of the question, betrays great confusion of ideas. He confounds physical with moral necessity; and frequently so intermingles acknowledged truths with mere assumptions, as to impose upon the reader who is unaccustomed to these speculations. He sets out with observing, that " Praise and blame, reward and punishment, uniformly imply that we think the party who is the object of them might have acted otherwise."* This assertion I must beg leave to deny; and whatever may be the popular opinion, the implication here stated is altogether unfounded. Reward and punishment, praise and blame, ought to be proportioned, and will be so under the Divine government, to the voluntary observance or violation of duty, that is, to the tendency of the disposition from which the action arises to produce happiness or misery. The power of the agent to have acted otherwise, so far from being requisite to constitute moral worth, would, as interfering with the efficacy of motives, destroy its very essence. Dr. C. thus concludes the

* Dis. I. p. 20.

passage to which I have referred: "And as soon as it is discovered that he acted under compulsion, we no longer measure the action by the standard of duty."* If the term *compulsion* is here employed in its usual acceptation, the assertion is perfectly true; but it is evident that Dr. C. conceives that an action which is *necessary* cannot be *voluntary*, not aware, perhaps, that the moral necessity which he so vehemently opposes does in fact imply the consent and exercise of the will. We affirm, with as much confidence as he does, that no action can merit either praise or blame unless it be voluntary, but its being *voluntary* is perfectly consistent with its being *necessary*. This point, I believe, not unfrequently embarrasses persons who have studied the subject but superficially. Every act which is conformable to the will of the agent, (presupposing his intellects to be in a sound state), will be acknowledged, I imagine, to be a *voluntary* act; but as the will is governed by motives and dispositions which, under the same circumstances, invariably operate in the same manner, the volition is said to be *necessary*, and the agent could not possibly act otherwise than he does. There is no *compulsion* in the case, but a natural series of antecedents and consequents. The circumstances in which a man is placed give rise to certain motives. These motives unavoidably influence his will, and the action follows the exertion of the will, precisely as any other effect follows its cause. Without freedom of the will, in the popular sense of the words, we admit that morality can have no existence; and this freedom we likewise contend is an essential property of human nature. Where there is no physical impediment, nothing can be more obvious than that every man may act as he pleases, and may freely follow his own choice. Not satisfied with this concession, Dr. Copleston wishes to establish that the will itself is under our power, and that the operation of motives is dependent on ourselves. The futility of these pretensions has been so often shewn, that I will not occupy the reader's time by a repetition of the arguments; and I will

only observe, that *moral responsibility* admits of but one rational explanation. He whose volitions invariably produce actions which tend to promote the ultimate happiness of himself and others, is deserving of praise and reward; while he whose conduct proceeds from principles of an opposite nature, as justly merits blame and punishment.

That blame is not to be imputed to actions occasioned by *physical* necessity, no one has ever ventured to deny; but this writer, with little discrimination, extends the remark to *moral* necessity. "If the necessity," he observes, "be not *absolute*, or *physical*, but depending on *moral* causes almost equally powerful, we still acquit the agent of responsibility, as in the case of soldiers performing their military duty, or the mere executioners of laws or decrees, however severe."* Without stopping to shew the irrelevancy of these two cases, which is sufficiently obvious, there is one circumstance which alone affords an ample refutation of the preacher's position, and that is, the *influence of habit*. One of the most striking examples of moral necessity is the habit of intoxication. After long-continued indulgence, it is known to be almost irresistible; and it will scarcely be disputed by our learned academic, that the more inveterate the passion, the less is it *in the power* of the unhappy victim to refuse compliance.

But according to the system of this zealous libertarian, in proportion as the *moral inability* to act otherwise increases, the culpability of the agent is diminished; that is to say, the more criminal the conduct of the individual, the more unjust must we regard the application of blame and punishment. The value of this argument, which is briefly stated in Dr. Milner's Essay, ought to be properly estimated by a writer so fond of the *reductio ad absurdum*, as the Oxford divine.

But where, it will be asked, can be the *justice* of punishing any individual for deeds which, as the necessarian contends, he could not avoid in the precise situation in which he was placed? For no other reason, we reply, can this treatment be deemed equitable, than because punishment

* Dis. I. p. 21.

* Dis. I. p. 21.

will be productive of good; or, in other words, because it tends to reform evil habits, and must in the course of time effect a total change in the disposition and will. Every consistent necessarian, therefore, ought to acknowledge (though there are many of this persuasion who do not) that the infliction of punishment which is not *corrective*, is nothing less than positive injustice and wanton cruelty.

The learned provost dwells with great complacency on what he alleges to be another unfavourable circumstance against his opponents,—that, in point of fact, they never act up to their principles, and that, however tenacious of their theory, they always treat men as free agents in the common concerns of life. But here, as on numerous other occasions, the writer confounds the two senses in which the term *liberty* is understood; for while we deny that a man could have acted otherwise than he has done, supposing the previous circumstances to remain unaltered, we assert that he is perfectly free to act in strict conformity with his choice. With more justice may we retort the charge of inconsistency on the libertarians, as no persons deviate more from their theoretic opinions in all that relates to the education of the young, and to the general system of moral discipline. It is certainly not a little singular, that on points so intimately connected with human happiness, their practice, generally speaking, coincides with that of the most rigid necessarians.

Dr. Copleston then proceeds to express his astonishment “how opinions so unreasonable and extravagant could ever acquire an ascendancy over the human mind;” and he endeavours to account for the paradox, as he terms it, by two considerations, on which he places peculiar stress. The first cause of the reception of the necessarian system he avers may be traced to the inaccurate use of language, and ignorance of its principles. It is extraordinary, however, that instead of having recourse to the writings of the best modern authors on the subject, he should select his principal example from the ancient defenders of the doctrine of *Fate*; and that in answering a sophism of the Stoics he should imagine that he is refuting the creed of the Necessarians.

When the present advocates of *necessity* introduce this celebrated argument of the *fatalists* as a bulwark in their defence, it will be time enough to examine how far Dr. C. has succeeded in his plan of demolition. He animadverts in a note on one or two expressions of Jonathan Edwards, which I think are liable to objection on another account, and that is, from his making use of the technical terms of scholastic logic in describing the operations of the Divine Mind: but the great *leading arguments* of that powerful reasoner he has not attempted to invalidate, and to this hour they remain unanswered. I by no means wish to dispute the propriety of some of Dr. C's. remarks on the terms *certain*, *probable*, *possible*, and others of a similar nature; but his application of them is very inadequate to solve the difficulties inseparable from his view of the question. Few writers perhaps have been more inaccurate in their modes of expression than our Oxford libertarian; and with a great parade of precision, he is perpetually confounding the popular with the philosophical freedom of the will, and constantly argues from the fatality of the ancients against the necessity of the moderns.

The second cause which he assigns for the admission of the necessarian system, is the pride of the human mind in refusing to believe that the *foreknowledge* of God may co-exist with the *contingency* of events. He contends, that since each of these truths can be proved independently of the other, we ought not to withhold our assent, because to our finite apprehensions they appear incompatible, and that we must therefore ever regard them not as *contradictions*, but as *apparent incongruities*.* Other writers have adopted nearly the same method of evading a difficulty which they are evidently afraid to encounter; but to any person not biassed by the prejudices of education and habit, it would not appear more preposterous to affirm that a figure may be rectilinear and curved at the same time, than to maintain the co-existence of prescience and contingency. Were there no favourite system to be supported, it would be admitted without

* Dis. II. p. 70.

a moment's doubt that the truth of the one proves the falsehood of the other. We may safely allow indeed, with Dr. C., that an event does not happen *because* it was foreseen, and that it is in no degree whatever influenced or affected by foreknowledge; but we certainly do maintain that it could not be foreseen unless it afterwards really takes place. To the assertion of Jonathan Edwards, that "infallible foreknowledge may prove the necessity of the event foreknown, and yet not be the thing that causes the necessity," Dr. C. replies, that infallible foreknowledge proves nothing, unless when the Being possessing this foreknowledge *declares* that an event will happen, and that even then it does not prove its necessity. But this writer ought to be aware that it is not the futurity but the *certainty* of an event from which we infer its necessity.

It is evident from the explicit language of these Discourses that the author entertains no doubt respecting the omniscience of the Deity, comprehending an intuitive knowledge of the past, the present, and the future. Now knowledge in the human mind undoubtedly proves the reality of the *subject* of that knowledge. We cannot strictly *know* any event to have happened, unless it actually has happened. We cannot be assured of the present existence of any object in nature which does not truly exist. And since the omniscience of God implies an infallible knowledge of the future, as well as of the past and present, it is clear that whatever he foresees, that is, the *subject* of his foreknowledge, must take place with absolute certainty; and from this certainty of the event we justly infer its *necessity*. For admitting, as we must, that the Supreme Being infallibly knows all the causes and effects in the universe, all the antecedents and consequents, then if any other effect could take place than that which actually does take place and is foreseen, it would follow that the same cause might produce different effects which have no necessary connexion with it. *Opposite* effects might proceed from the *same* cause; and if this is not a glaring contradiction, it would be difficult to say what is. In short, it seems impossible to deny that unless an event be *necessarily* dependent on its cause,

it could not be foreseen. But what, let me also ask, is a contingent event but one which either may or may not happen? And how can it be foreknown to happen when it is known, at the same time, that it may not happen? In truth, a grosser solecism in reasoning cannot be conceived than that which is displayed in the attempt to prove the possibility of foreknowing a contingent event.

The necessarian system, however, is also established by arguments wholly independent of that which is derived from the prescience of the Deity; and that reasoning which, however forcible it may possibly be in other respects, omits all notice of those arguments, must be regarded as extremely defective. But even supposing for one moment that the doctrine of *free-will* were as truly susceptible of independent proof as our opponents allege, and as we maintain to be the case with *necessity*, yet if the one is found to be irreconcilable with the usual and legitimate notions of the Divine foreknowledge, while the other is shewn not only to be compatible with it, but to derive from it an additional and most powerful evidence, there can be no room for hesitation to which of these opposing doctrines a dispassionate inquirer ought to yield his assent.

The two last of Dr. Copleston's Discourses are employed in applying the principles before explained to the Calvinistic tenet of Predestination; but as my object was merely to shew the futility of his objections against the truth of the necessarian doctrine, I shall not pursue his reasoning on that part of the subject. It is a remarkable circumstance, however, that he has laid himself open to attack even where we might have supposed him to be most secure. Adopting the sentiments of Archbishop King, who contends that the attributes ascribed to the Deity must be understood merely in an *analogical* sense, he has called forth an able opponent, to whom we are indebted for a satisfactory exposure of the dangerous consequences of such a concession to our belief in the *moral* qualities of the Supreme Being. Though Mr. Grinfield coincides with the Provost of Oriel on the main subject of dispute, yet on the particular point discussed in the *Vindiciæ Analogicæ*, the de-

feat of his antagonist is in my opinion complete.

I have only to observe, in conclusion, that with all Dr. Copleston's learning and talent, his reputation as a sound reasoner is greatly impaired by the present publication. He has absurdly attempted to identify the doctrines of *Fate* and *Philosophical Necessity*; he has failed in proving the two pernicious consequences which he attributes to the latter; his principal example of fallacy in the use of language is irrelevant to the purpose for which it was introduced; and his reasoning on the distinction between *analogy* and *resemblance* has been combated with signal success.

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS

SIR,

A LATE occurrence in my neighbourhood led me to reflect upon the gross inconsistency of the ultra-religious, who place so much of their religion in the Jewish observance of the sabbath. They will harass and distress a poor widow who sells for her livelihood a bunch of greens on the Sunday, and yet they themselves will countenance and uphold practices which are equally a violation of the sanctity of the day, according to their own notion of sanctity. Without any doubt of its propriety, they take places in short stage-coaches, (the difference between *shorts* and *longs* in this respect involves a great deal of religion) or call hackney-coaches on the Sunday, though these vehicles cannot run without taking many persons (horse-keepers, drivers, watermen, &c.) from church duties, and laying a burden upon the poor beasts employed, which the Jewish sabbatic law forbids. They will also open without compunction letters by the Monday's post, which have been on the road all the preceding day, and in their transit have made a host of sabbath-breakers. And again, who reads more eagerly the Monday morning newspapers, the getting up of which is well known to occupy the printers a great part of the Sunday in labour?—These inconsistencies should surely teach the eager observers of days and prosecutors, or, correctly speaking, persecutors, of non-observers, that they have something of the Pharisee in

them; for while they strain at the gnat, they swallow the camel.

A few years ago an association was formed for enforcing, by the strong arm of the law, "the better observance of the Lord's day." An appeal was made to the public for support in a project which was to divert the wrath of God from a guilty land. One of the patrons of the pious scheme was, at the very time of its announcement, seen every Sunday driving a pair of jaded horses from pillar to post—from a Tabernacle here, to an Ebenezer there, in order, no doubt, to explain and recommend the duty of man and beast doing no manner of work on the seventh day, which in popular oratory is always assumed to be the *first day* of the week. The projector of the combination was young in a profession, the members of which sometimes make work for themselves; and if this sabbatic company be dissolved, it may be supposed to be owing to other and more profitable companies having been projected.

Works of necessity and charity have been generally allowed on the Sunday by the severest Sabbatarians; but so far do some professors of the sabbath day carry this their religion, that they hold it unlawful to take off the beard on this day, and even begin to look with an evil eye upon Sunday-schools. The Wesleyan Methodists have determined in Conference that the sabbath is profaned when it is employed in teaching poor children to write!

With all this zeal for the sanctity of the Lord's day, we see the chapels of the zealots frequently turned into seats of money-changers. Sunday is the great day for collections, though it is contrary to the Jewish law of the sabbath to touch money within the sacred twenty-four hours. Nay, there is a great trade carried on in some of the most thronged chapels on the Sunday; the vestry being turned into a shop for the sale of hymn-books, tune-books, sermons and pamphlets.

I am no enemy, I am a sincere friend, to the religious employment of the first day of the week; but I cannot consent to the application to Christians of merely Jewish laws, nor hear without strong dislike professions contradicted by practice.

ONE OF THE GENTILES.

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—POPE.

The Works of Anna Lætitia Barbauld, &c.

(Continued from p. 489.)

MRS. BARBAULD's poems all breathe the same spirit of liberty and humanity; without interfering with political questions beyond the limits that her sex marked out for her, she was well known to sympathize with the supporters of liberal opinions, and her feelings are beautifully expressed in many of her verses. We take the following, not as the best specimen, but as being accordant with the object of the *Monthly Repository*, and not very likely to be transplanted into any other periodical work:

"TO DR. PRIESTLEY,
December 29, 1792.

"Stirs not thy spirit, Priestley! as the train
With low obeisance, and with servile phrase,
File behind file, advance, with supple knee,
And lay their necks beneath the foot of power?
Burns not thy cheek indignant, when thy name,
On which delighted Science loved to dwell,
Becomes the bandied theme of hooting crowds?
With timid caution or with cool reserve,
When e'en each Reverend brother keeps aloof,
Eyes the struck deer, and leaves thy naked side
A mark for Power to shoot at? Let it be.
'On evil days though fallen and evil tongues,
To thee, the slander of a passing age
Imports not. Scenes like these hold little space
In his large mind, whose ample stretch of thought
Grasps future periods. Well canst thou afford
To give large credit for that debt of fame
Thy country owes thee. Calm thou canst consign it
To the slow payment of that distant day,—
If distant,—when thy name, to Freedom's joined,
Shall meet the thanks of a regenerate land."

l. 183, 184.

There is great tenderness in the following elegiac verses, l. 168—172.

"Epistle to Dr. ENFIELD,

On his revisiting Warrington in 1789.

"Friend of those years which from Youth's sparkling fount
With silent lapse down Time's swift gulf have run!

Friend of the years, whate'er be their amount,
Which yet remain beneath life's evening sun!

O when thy feet retrace that western shore

Where Mersey winds his waters to the main,

When thy fond eyes familiar haunts explore,

And paths well nigh effaced are tracked again;

Will not thy heart with mixed emotions thrill,

As scenes succeeding scenes arise to view?

While joy or sorrow past alike shall fill

Thy glistening eyes with Feeling's tender dew.

Shades of light transient Loves shall pass thee by,

And glowing Hopes, and Sports of youthful vein;

And each shall claim one short, half-pleasing sigh,

A farewell sigh to Love's and Fancy's reign.

Lo there the seats where Science loved to dwell,

Where Liberty her ardent spirit breathed;

While each glad Naiad from her secret cell

Her native sedge with classic honours wreathed.

O seats beloved in vain! Your rising dome

With what fond joy my youthful eyes surveyed;

Pleased by your sacred springs to find my home,

And tune my lyre beneath your growing shade!

Does Desolation spread his gloomy veil

Your grass-grown courts and silent halls along?

Or busy hands there pile the cumbrous sail,

And trade's harsh din succeed the Muse's song?

Yet still, perhaps, in some sequestered
walk
Thine ear shall catch the tales of other
times ;
Still in faint sounds the learned echoes
talk,
Where unprofaned as yet by vulgar
chimes.
Do not the deeply wounded trees still
bear
The dear memorial of some infant
flame?
And murmuring sounds yet fill the
hallowed air,
Once vocal to the youthful poet's
fame?
For where her sacred step impressed
the Muse,
She left a long perfume through all
the bowers ;
Still mayst thou gather thence Casta-
lian dews
In honeyed sweetness clinging to the
flowers.
Shrouded in stolen glance, here timo-
rous Love
The grave rebuke of careful Wisdom
drew,
With wholesome frown austere, who
vainly strove
To shield the sliding heart from Beau-
ty's view.
Go fling this garland in fair Mersey's
stream,
From the true lovers that have trod
his banks ;
Say, Thames to Avon still repeats his
theme ;
Say, Hymen's captives send their votive
thanks.
Visit each shade and trace each weep-
ing rill
To holy Friendship or to Fancy known,
And climb with zealous step the fir-
crowned hill,
Where purple foxgloves fringe the rug-
ged stone :
And if thou seest, on some neglected
spray,
The lyre which soothed my careless
hours so much ;
The shattered relic to my hands con-
vey, —
The murmuring strings shall answer
to thy touch.
Were it, like thine, my lot once more
to tread
Plains now but seen in distant per-
spective,
With that soft hue, that dubious gloom
o'erspread
That tender tint which only time can
give ;

How would it open every secret cell
Where cherished thought and fond re-
membrance sleep!
How many a tale each conscious step
would tell!
How many a parted friend these eyes
would weep!
But, O the chief! if in thy feeling breast
The tender charities of life reside,
If there domestic love have built her nest,
And thy fond heart a parent's cares
divide;
Go seek the turf where worth, where
wisdom lies,
Wisdom and worth, ah, never to return!
There kneeling, weep my tears and
breathe my sighs,
A daughter's sorrows o'er her father's
urn!"

Some of the lighter pieces now first
presented to the public are exquisitely
finished. We select the following, *I.*
212—214, which, though less playful
and less rich in imagination than some
others, comes recommended to us by
its moral :

"PEACE AND SHEPHERD.

"Low in a deep sequestered vale,
Whence Alpine heights ascend,
A beauteous nymph, in pilgrim garb,
Is seen her steps to bend.
Her olive garland drops with gore;
Her scattered tresses torn,
Her bleeding breast, her bruised feet,
Bespeak a maid forlorn.
'From bower and hall and palace driven,
To these lone wilds I flee;
My name is Peace, I love the cot;
O Shepherd, shelter me!
'O beauteous pilgrim, why dost thou
From bower and palace flee?
So soft thy voice, so sweet thy look,
Sure all would shelter thee.'
'Like Noah's dove, no rest I find;
The din of battle roars
Where once my steps I loved to print
Along the myrtle shores:
For ever in my frightened ears
The savage war-whoop sounds;
And, like a panting hare, I fly
Before the opening hounds.'
'Pilgrim, those spiry groves among,
The mansions thou mayst see,
Where cloister'd saints chaunt holy hymns,
Sure such would shelter thee!
'Those roofs with trophied banners
stream,
There martial hymns resound;
And, Shepherd, oft from croziered hands,
This breast has felt a wound.'

' Ah! gentle pilgrim, glad would I
Those tones for ever hear!
With thee to share my scanty lot,
That lot to me were dear.

But lo, along the vine-clad steep,
The gleam of armour shines;
His scattered flock, his straw-roofed hut,
The helpless swain resigns.

And now the smouldering flames aspire,
Their lurid light I see;
I hear the human wolves approach;
I cannot shelter thee."

The "Ode to Remorse," I. 251—260, is perhaps, of all that is new in the "Works," the greatest effort of Mrs. Barbauld's muse. The numbers are finely varied; the characters suitable and striking; the imagery bold and at the same time natural. There is true poetic spirit in these lines:

"Cruel Remorse! when Youth and Pleasure sport,
And thoughtless Folly keeps her court,
Crouching 'midst rosy bowers thou lurk'st unseen;
Slumbering the festal hours away,
While Youth disports in that enchanting scene;
Till on some fated day
Thou with a tiger-spring dost leap upon thy prey,
And tear his helpless breast, o'erwhelm'd with wild dismay."

The conclusion, in which Remorse is described as effacing guilt and subsiding into penitence, and a prayer is offered for the atoning "tears of meek contrition," will not be regarded by the many as orthodox in its theology, but must still be admired for its genuine poetry by those that cannot take delight in it as the effusion of Christian charity.

The "Hymns" are inserted together at the end of the 1st volume. It is singular that some of them are not regular in the metre. There are several metrical irregularities in H. VII., "Come, said Jesus' sacred voice," which the author corrected in the copy from which the hymn was printed in Mr. Aspland's Selection. This is a great fault in compositions designed to be sung. Only one new Hymn is here introduced (H. IX.), and we find it difficult to believe that it is really Mrs. Barbauld's: it is of various metres, if of any, and the sense is not always discoverable. What can be made of the first stanza?

"Joy to the followers of the Lord!
Thus saith the sure, the eternal word,
Not of earth the joy it brings,
Tempered in celestial springs."

I. 339.

The prose works consist of letters and some light pieces now printed for the first time, and of tracts published at various periods during Mrs. Barbauld's life, some with and some without her name.

The "Correspondence," which occupies a third of the volume, is peculiarly interesting. There is an ease and grace in the letters which reminds us of Cowper. Could a volume have been made up of Mrs. Barbauld's epistolary effusions, it would no doubt have obtained great popularity.

Some of the letters were written on a tour on the Continent: we meet in them, as might have been expected, with some interesting accounts of the French and Swiss Protestants.

"Nismes is the very centre of the Protestants. They are computed to be 30,000, and the richest part of the inhabitants; for here, as the Dissenters in England, they give themselves to trade. They have no church, nor even barn; but assemble in the *desert*, as they call it, in the open air, in a place surrounded by rocks, which reverberate the voice. The pulpit is moveable, and there are a few seats of stone for the elders. On their great festivals they say the sight is very striking."—H. 46, 47.

"Will you hear how they pass the Sunday at Geneva? They have service at seven in the morning, nine, and at two; after that they assemble in parties for conversation, cards and dancing, and finish the day at the theatre.

"Did not you think they had been stricter at Geneva than to have plays on the Sunday, especially as it is but two or three years since they were allowed at all? The service at their churches is seldom much more than an hour, and I believe few people go more than once a day. As soon as the text is named, the minister puts on his hat, in which he is followed by all the congregation, except those whose hats and heads have never any connexion, for you well know that to put his hat upon his head is the last use a well dressed Frenchman would think of putting it to. At proper periods of the discourse the minister stops short and turns his back to you, in order to blow his nose, which is a signal for all the congregation to do the same; and a glorious concert it is, for the weather is already severe, and people have got colds.

I am told, too, that he takes this time to refresh his memory by peeping at his sermon, which lies behind him in the pulpit."—II. 64, 65.

In some strictures on a sentiment of the late Dr. Fordyce's, Mrs. Barbauld is led by her correct moral taste to point out "a piece of parade" in that popular preacher :

"It is not true, what (*as*) Dr. Fordyce insinuates, that women's friendships are not sincere; I am sure it is not: I remember when I read it I had a good mind to have burnt the book for that unkind passage. I hope the Doctor will give us our revenge, as he has begun his sermons to young men: they were advertised in the papers:—was it not a piece of parade unbecoming a preacher? It would be difficult to determine whether the age is growing better or worse; for I think our plays are growing like sermons and our sermons like plays."—II. 59.

The comparison of the characters of Dr. Priestley and Mirabeau in the following passage is in Mrs. Barbauld's happiest manner :

"I last Sunday attended, with melancholy satisfaction, the funeral sermon of good Dr. Price, preached by Dr. Priestley, who, as he told us, had been thirty years his acquaintance and twenty years his intimate friend. He well delineated the character he so well knew. I had just been reading an *éloge* of Mirabeau, and I could not help, in my own mind, comparing both the men and the tribute paid to their memories. The one died when a reputation, raised suddenly by extraordinary emergencies, was at its height, and very possibly might have ebbed again had he lived longer:—the other enjoyed an esteem, the fruit of a course of labours uniformly directed, through a long life, to the advancement of knowledge and virtue, a reputation slowly raised, without and independent of popular talents. The panegyrist of the one was obliged to sink his private life, and to cover with the splendid mantle of public merit the crimes and failings of the man:—the private character of the other was able to bear the severest scrutiny; neither slander nor envy, nor party prejudice, ever pretended to find a spot in it. The one was followed even by those who did not trust him; the other was confided in and trusted even by those who reprobated his principles. In pronouncing the *éloge* on Mirabeau, the author scarcely dares to insinuate a vague and uncertain hope that his spirit may hover somewhere in the void space of immensity, be rejoined to the first

principles of nature; and attempts to soothe his shade with a cold and barren immortality in the remembrance of posterity. Dr. Priestley parts with his intimate friend with all the cheerfulness which an assured hope of meeting him soon again could give, and at once dries the tear he excites."—II. 84—86.

Mrs. Barbauld's criticisms on books are, we think, generally just, and they are always candid. She thus writes of Joanna Bailie's tragedies :

"I have received great pleasure lately from the representation of *De Montfort*, a tragedy which you probably read a year and half ago, in a volume entitled, *A Series of Plays on the Passions*. I admired it then, but little dreamed I was indebted for my entertainment to a young lady of Hampstead, whom I visited, and who came to Mr. Barbauld's meeting all the while with as innocent a face as if she had never written a line. The play is admirably acted by Mrs. Siddons and Kemble, and is finely written, with great purity of sentiment, beauty of diction, strength and originality of character; but it is open to criticism: I cannot believe such a hatred natural. The affection between the brother and sister is most beautifully touched, and as far as I know, quite new. The play is somewhat too good for our present taste."—II. 67, 68.

Does she exercise her usual taste and judgment when she says of Burns's "*Cotter's Saturday Night*," II. 151, it "has much of the same kind of merit as the *Schoolmistress*"? No two poets are more unlike than Shenstone and the *Ayrshire Ploughman*, nor is their dissimilarity any where more apparent than in these two poems.

There is a very striking remark, II. 137, upon the death of Lord Byron—"He has filled a leaf in the book of fame, but it is a very blotted leaf."

The prediction at the conclusion of the following passage remains to be fulfilled, though we confess we do not see any indication of the fulfilment being near :

"Last week we met the American bishops at Mr. V.'s—if bishops they may be called, without title, without revenue, without diocese, and without lawn sleeves. I wonder our bishops will consecrate them, for they have made very free with the Common Prayer, and have left out two creeds out of three. Indeed, as to the Athanasian creed, the King has forbidden it in his chapel, so that will soon fall."—(1787) II. 151.

We quote some remarks on Madame du Deffand's Letters, as being Mrs. Barbauld's testimony to the value of "religious hopes and feelings:"

"I am wading through the letters of Madame du Deffand, in four volumes. Have you read them? Walpole and she wrote every week, and they were continually grumbling at each other, yet they went on. Walpole, poor man, seems to have been terribly afraid that this old blind lady was in love with him; and he had much ado to reduce her expressions of friendship to something of an English standard. This lady appears to have been very unhappy. She was blind indeed, but she had every thing else that could make age comfortable; fortune, friends, talents, consideration in the world, the society of all the wits and all the people of rank of Paris, or who visited Paris, but she totally wanted the best support of all, religious feelings and hopes; and I do not know any thing that is likely to impress their importance more on the mind than the perusal of these letters. You see her tired of life, almost blaspheming Providence for having given her existence; yet dreading to die because she had no hopes beyond death. A lady told me she would not, on any account, let her daughter read the letters. I think, for my part, they give in this view as good a lesson as you can pick out of Mrs. More's Practical Piety, which, if you have not read, I cannot help it."—II. 68, 69.

A passing observation on Bible Societies may be seasonably extracted:

"We have had a meeting here (Stoke Newington) for an auxiliary Bible Society. Many ladies went, not indeed to speak, but to hear speaking; and they tell me they were much entertained and interested. I honour the zeal of these societies; but it is become a sort of rage, and I suspect outgoes the occasion."—II. 95, 96.

Mrs. Barbauld sometimes moralizes, but it is without affectation. There is no sickly sentimentality in any of her reflections. The following passage from a letter to Mrs. Estlin, relating to her spending a day at Chigwell, shews in what manner she turned passing objects to a moral account:

"The road to Chigwell is through a part of Hainault Forest; and we stopped to look at Fairlop oak, one of the largest in England; a complete ruin, but a noble ruin, which it is impossible to see without thinking of Cowper's beautiful lines, 'Who lived when thou wast such.' The immoveable rocks and mountains present us rather with an idea of eternity than of long life. There they

are, and there they have been before the birth of nations. The tops of the everlasting hills have been covered with snow from the earliest records of time. But a tree, that has life and growth like ourselves, that, like ourselves, was once small and feeble, that certainly some time began to be,—to see it attain a size so enormous, and in its bulk and its slow decay bear record of the generations it has outlived,—this brings our comparative feebleness strongly in view. 'Man passeth away, and where is he?'—while 'the oak of our fathers' will be the oak of their children, and their children.'—II. 133, 134.

In the Letters we find some allegories, a favourite species of composition with Mrs. Barbauld; but those on the New Year, II. 61, 62, and the Pedigree of Leisure, II. 72, 73, appear to us to be somewhat stiff and quaint, and the latter is open to other objections.

We find that the speech of the Curé of the Banks of the Rhone at the bar of the National Assembly, published in an early number of Mr. B Flower's "Cambridge Intelligencer," and reprinted in The Christian Reformer, I. 225—228, was a jeu d'esprit of Mrs. Barbauld's, written in 1791. II. 260.

The Rhapsody on Evil, II. 272—276, is familiar to us, but we know not where we have read it.

Of the pamphlets published by Mrs. Barbauld, there are reprinted here—"An Address to the Opposers of the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts;" "Sins of the Government, Sins of the Nation; or, a Discourse for the Fast, appointed on April 19, 1793;" "Remarks on Mr. Gilbert Wakefield's Enquiry into the Expediency and Propriety of Public or Social Worship." The "Civic Sermons to the People," two we think in number, always attributed to Mrs. Barbauld, are omitted; yet the reader may see by a fine passage from them in The Christian Reformer, IV. 442—446, that they are not unworthy of the writer's reputation, high as it is and must ever be.

We do not pretend to criticise those works of Mrs. Barbauld's that have been long before the public. She has established her name as a beautiful writer; she is, in our judgment, the first of English female authors; and we should find it difficult to name more than two or three modern authors of the other sex who can stand a comparison with her in both verse and prose.

POETRY.

SONNET TO —.

O! BEAUTIFUL in life and spirit! Thou
Hast truly learned Christ, and in thy breast
His pure and gentle precepts are imprest,
A Christian's peace upon thy calm white brow.
Thou fear'st not sorrow—and the overthrow
Of fondest hope in thee could never raise
E'en one distrustful sigh—for round thee plays
Religion's light and virtue's angel glow.
Thou dost not shrink from pain—and when the cross
Is heavy on thee, still thy smile of love
Beams sweetly through thy tears—and far above
Thy 'rapt heart soars for comfort in its loss.
God is in all thy thoughts, and in thy face
Beam faith, and tenderness, and heavenly grace.

J. E. R.

LINES.

Go, Pilgrim, take the word of life,
The light, the glory of thy path,
And fearless enter mortal strife,
All trial human nature hath.
Thou shalt not fail if by that guide
Thy steps are led—if in thine heart
That blest commandment thou dost hide
Which in eternity hath part.
When thou goest forth, by it be led—
When sleep falls softly o'er thine eyes,
Be that the guardian round thy head,
The trust that soothes tired nature's sighs.
And when the gentle light of heaven,
Revives thy soul, be thy first thought
The hope, the peace that word has given—
The joy, the virtue it has wrought.
So fix thine eyes—and if they move
From the blest record here below,
O! be it to that Heaven above,
That source whence all our blessings flow.
So walk through life, thy Father's hand,
Although invisible, thy guard;
And thou shalt reach that purer land,
Where faithfulness hath its reward.

SONNET.

O! open to that young and suffering heart,
Father of Mercies! that bright blessed ray
Of power to chase the fiends of care away,
And tenderer thoughts and sweeter hopes impart.

Unfold *Thyself*, all goodness as Thou art,
 All excellence and beauty, to his soul;
 Be Heaven's own softness in the tears that start,
 And every sigh breath'd in thy blest controul.
 O! raise him from the things of time and earth,
 The hopes, and fears, and sorrows born of dust,
 To the high glories of his heavenly birth,
 And manly duties of his earthly trust;
 Till doubt, and grief, and youthful anguish cease,
 And Thou *Thyself* become "his strength and peace."

FRAGMENT.

ON THE HOPE OF HEAVEN.

Beautiful Hope! that—like the lily's light,
 Silvering the waters ere they wind away—
 Mak'st, as they glide, the waves of time all bright
 With the pure reflex of diviner day!

Halcyon of Heaven! beneath thy wing, the dark
 And stormy Future trembles into smiles;
 And sweet winds breathe, to waft the mourner's bark
 To fairer oceans, and to greener isles!

Oh, what were life, wert thou not near to throw
 Thy radiant Iris o'er its clouds and tears—
 To pour, upon this jarring world below,
 The prophet music of elysian spheres?

* * * * *

Crediton.

OBITUARY.

1825. JUNE 16, at *Hofstetton, Près de Thun*, in Switzerland, Mrs. M. BROWN, wife of P. J. Brown, Esq., late of Thistle Grove, Middlesex, and only daughter of the Rev. T. Latham, of Bramfield, Suffolk, aged 31 years. She was married at the age of 19 to Mr. B., in whom she enjoyed one of the most excellent and most affectionate of husbands, and he enjoyed in her a most amiable and estimable wife. Their mutual attachment was such as rendered the conjugal relation a source of the purest pleasure, and conferred a happiness on each which is rarely exceeded in the domestic walks of life. But as this world affords a paradise for none of its inhabitants, and the great Father of all has made this life a state of trial and discipline to all his rational offspring, He was pleased in his wise and gracious providence to exercise the virtues of this amiable couple by the very delicate state of health which Mrs.

B. has generally been subjected to for more than eleven years past. When every means that the tenderest affection could devise to restore her to health had been tried, without the desired effect, as the last effort, Mr. B. removed to the Continent, purely to obtain for her the benefits of a salubrious climate. But the great Power, in whose hands is the breath of all mankind, had fixed the bounds which she could not pass. Youth, and beauty, and riches, were vain. Affectionate solicitude, and the most humble and earnest importunity at the throne of grace, proved unavailing to add to the appointed term of life; and, as one among the ten thousand proofs which every day affords us, that "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man but as the flower of grass," this excellent woman was thus early spatched from all the enjoyments and occupations of the present state. She expired so tranquilly

that her husband, in whose supporting arms she had been slumbering, was not for some time aware of the loss he had sustained.

Mrs. Brown was trained up, till her twentieth year, in the system of Calvinism, yet her well-constructed mind could never receive that revolting creed; and her disposition and conduct were worthy of the more liberal Christian views which she adopted.

T. L.

Bramfield, Suffolk.

SEPT. 1, at his house in the *West Street*, Chichester, in the 78th year of his age, WILLIAM GUY, Esq., Surgeon.

If general and signal worth of character, united to a sincere and enlightened attachment to those views of Christian doctrine which for so long a series of years the *Monthly Repository* has most ably and successfully advocated, may give a claim to a place in its obituary, few individuals can have a greater claim to that distinction than the subject of this article.

Mr. Guy was born at Northampton. His mother dying when he was very young, his father, who was of the medical profession, removed to London, and soon afterwards to Chichester, in the near neighbourhood of which city several of his more immediate relatives filled respectable situations as agriculturists. The line of Mr. G. sen.'s practice was that of an apothecary, and was therefore necessarily confined: he nevertheless took his son, when he left the grammar-school, as an articled apprentice. In the latter part of this connexion the young medical élève entered into a temporary partnership with some itinerant inoculator for the small-pox. This proved a source of no small pecuniary emolument. After a very short interval Mr. G. entered on his professional studies in London, when he was received as a house pupil under Mr. John Hunter, and as a dresser, and in other respects as an assistant, to Mr. Bromfield at St. George's Hospital. In all these situations he attended with great diligence Dr. George Fordyce on the different subjects on which he lectured, and Dr. William Hunter on anatomy, and his host and preceptor J. Hunter on surgery. In the year 1772, his pursuits were interrupted by a severe illness, and by the measures necessary to confirm his recovery from it. After no long interval he returned to Chichester, and entered into partnership with his father, practising as a medical surgeon and accoucheur, and continuing to perform the laborious duties

of these professions for the space of nearly half a century, with a degree of acceptance and popularity which has been seldom surpassed. His benevolence, liberality, and disinterestedness, recommended him to all classes, insomuch that his opinion had greater weight with the public than that of most of his contemporaries. This was not to be ascribed to any thing like ostentation or puffing on his part, for no one could be more free from that infirmity; but the cheerfulness of his temper led him to see every thing in a favourable light, so that his hopes and predictions encouraged and supported his patients under maladies which the utmost efforts of his skill, and of that of his professional brethren, were insufficient to remove. In aid of this a peculiar vein of humour, which he never failed to make subservient to some good-natured purpose, had very considerable effect. It is not therefore to be wondered at that he was fond of his profession; the fatigues of which he continued to encounter long after the infirmities of age, and the frequent attacks of a painful disease, should have warned him to retire.

During his professional studies in the metropolis, attendance on the public services of the celebrated Mr. Martin Madan, and other divines of that class, made him extremely partial to a system characterised more by orthodoxy than by reasonableness or moderation. Afterwards a candid spirit of inquiry led him to peruse with attention the theological and metaphysical writings of Dr. Priestley, and he became a thorough convert to most of the opinions advocated by that distinguished man. On the subjects of the controversy between the Unitarians and their opponents, his diligence of research could be equalled only by his impartiality. He read almost every thing of consequence on both sides of the question: and, not content with reading, he extracted, and with unwearied labour brought together in opposition, the innumerable texts, topics, and arguments adduced by each party. The ostensible result of all this was several bulky volumes of manuscript, and the internal effect a deep-rooted conviction that *Unitarianism is the doctrine of the gospel*. In connexion with this, his ideas of the Divine government were in perfect unison with those so ably and pleasingly stated in Mr. Lindsey's *Conversations* on that subject. Of these sentiments the natural and happy result was a fervent and cheerful piety, and an entire submission to his Maker under very painful trials.

In his last illness, till within two or

three days of his dissolution, he enjoyed the perfect use of his faculties, and gave frequent proofs of that characteristic quickness of perception, and facetiousness of manner, which in health had so often delighted his friends. In these circumstances it was singularly pleasing to witness the effects of those mental habits which he had taken so much pains to acquire. Although he entirely acceded to the hypothesis of an ingenious writer in the *Theological Repository*, [Vol. II. p. 350, 3d Edit.], that to every man "the resurrection takes place immediately after death," he had no ecstatic or enthusiastic anticipations of his future condition. His mind was filled with a calm and humble hope of the forgiveness and favour of his Maker, promised by his Saviour to all who truly believe and obey him. Very justly did one of his physicians (Dr. Forbes) remark to him, "We can do you no good, but you do us a great deal, by giving us an example how we should feel and act in your situation." In one of the intervals between the fits of somnolency, in which, at one period of his illness, he passed much of his time, the writer of this article congratulated him on the degree of rest and exemption from pain which he enjoyed, he replied, "*in celo quies*, and I hope this is the beginning of it." On another occasion, when suffering much from the distressing effects of an irritable stomach, he said to the same person, "This is all right: I am sure it is so; it is no otherwise than it should be." He repeatedly avowed his perfect satisfaction with the system he had adopted, and was in all respects a signal example of the efficacy of that system in supporting the sincere Christian in his conflict with *the last enemy*.

Mr. Guy's family were members of the Church of England. He was educated in that communion, and continued in it to the end of his life, regularly attending its *evening* services. For reasons which were perfectly satisfactory to his own mind he adopted this course. Arguments of a *general* nature, and (in my apprehension) of invincible force, may be urged against it. What in *particular* cases can be said for it, must be left to the individuals concerned, and with no others is it a proper subject of inquiry. In the relations of social and domestic life Mr. Guy was most exemplary and amiable. His liberality in the exercise of his profession will be long

remembered by the objects of his kindness, and by their descendants.

HYLAS.

Chichester, Sept. 17, 1825.

AT the manse of Wilton, in the vicinity of Hawick, the Rev. SAMUEL CHARTERS, D.D., in or about the 84th year of his age, and 57th of his ministry. The father and grandfather of Dr. Charters were successively ministers of Inverkeithing, in the Presbytery of Dunfermline. Dr. Charters, after going through his preparatory studies at the college of Glasgow, and obtaining a licence to preach the gospel, passed a short time on the Continent, and was, after his return, ordained minister of Kincardine, in the Presbytery of Dunblane, in the year 1763. During his incumbency there, and ever afterwards, he enjoyed the friendship of the late eminent judge and scholar, Lord Kames, whose country seat, Blair Drummond, was in the parish. He had thus a favourable opportunity of extending his literary acquaintance, and his knowledge of the world. In the year 1772, he was translated to the church and parish of Wilton. In that retired and rural residence on the banks of the Teviot, far from the strife and bustle of the world, he passed the remainder of his useful and unambitious life, attracting to his hospitable dwelling not only many of his early friends, who delighted to renew their intercourse with him from time to time, but enlightened strangers, who were desirous of cultivating his acquaintance. Dr. Charters published 2 vols. of sermons at Edinburgh in 1786, and several single sermons, some of which were collected into a volume printed at Hawick in 1807. That on the duty of making a will is curious, but judicious and useful. No one indeed can read any of Dr. Charters's sermons without instruction and pleasure. They are simple and colloquial, and abound in anecdote and passages of history, and on these accounts may be recommended to congregational libraries, and other collections of books for young persons. The theology found in them is liberal, the morality is Evangelical. One of the characters eulogised in the excellent discourse on Alms-giving is that of Thomas Firmin, the celebrated benefactor to the city of London, and one of the earliest avowed Unitarians in England.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Southern Unitarian Society.

THE Annual Meeting of the *Southern Unitarian Society* took place at Poole, on Wednesday, August 3rd, when the Rev. Edmund Kell, of Newport, delivered an admirable sermon, on the Superior Influence of Unitarianism over Calvinism, considered as a Moral System, and urged his hearers, from the question in the fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel, "What do ye more than others?" to see that they conducted themselves worthy of the principles they professed to esteem. In the evening, the Rev. J. Fullagar, of Chichester, addressed a numerous audience, on the Nature of the "Damnable Heresies" mentioned by the Apostle Peter, and in his discourse clearly shewed, that the charge of "denying the Lord that bought them," frequently made against the Unitarians, could not be applied to them, without setting scripture phraseology and ecclesiastical history at defiance. After the service in the morning, the business of the Society was transacted, Thomas Cooke, Esq., of Newport, having been called to the Chair, and the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

That, while the members of this Society deeply deplore that the attempt to relieve conscientious Unitarians from the present Marriage Service, has again been frustrated, they feel themselves the more obliged to those friends of civil and religious liberty in both Houses of the Legislature, who have continued to support their cause, and beg hereby to return them their cordial thanks.

That the members of this Society, deeply feeling the great obligations under which they lie to that upright and enlightened Senator, William Smith, Esq., for his endeavours to procure them relief from the present Marriage Service, and for his judicious and unremitting exertions in favour of civil and religious liberty, beg to return him their sincerest thanks, and to express their hope, that his life will, by a gracious Providence, be long preserved, for the furtherance of those plans connected with the moral and social welfare of mankind, by the steady pursuit of which, his senatorial career has been uniformly characterized.

That the renewed thanks of the members of the Southern Unitarian Society

be individually presented to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the most Noble the Marquis of Lansdown, the Right Hon. Lord Liverpool, and the Right Hon. Lord Holland, for their late support of the Unitarian Bill in the House of Lords, accompanied with an expression of their confidence, that the continued endeavours of their Lordships will not be wanting to obtain for Unitarians the liberty that has been already granted them by the Commons House of Parliament, of solemnizing their Marriage Contracts in conformity with their religious principles.

After the business of the Society was finished, the members of the Society dined together at the Antelope Inn, to whose pleasure, the talents and zeal of James Young, Esq., of Hackney, who kindly consented to preside, not a little contributed.

A great wish was expressed that some steps should be taken to introduce Unitarian principles into Southampton, Salisbury, Romsey, and other neighbouring places, and an instruction was given to the Committee to keep this object in view, and, if possible, to act in conjunction with the Southern Unitarian Fund for its accomplishment.

The thanks of the Society were voted to Mr. Price, its worthy Secretary; and Mr. Fullagar (who acted as Secretary for Mr. P., he having been prevented from attending the Meeting) was requested to forward copies of the votes of thanks to the several distinguished individuals above-mentioned.

The Secretary has received the following letter from Lord Holland, in acknowledgment of the Society's resolution of thanks communicated to him.

(Copy.)

SIR,

I beg you to accept for yourself, and to convey to the other members of the Southern Unitarian Society, my thanks, for your flattering notice of my earnest endeavours to contribute to an act of justice due to persons of your religious persuasion. It will always be my wish to see persons of every religious opinion exempted from insult, as well as from injury, on account of their opinions; and to exact from those who differ from the Church, a conformity in the points on which they differ, as the condition of legalizing such an important contract, as that of marriage, appears to me both insulting and injurious. You may always

call upon me to do my utmost to remove this hardship.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
VASSALL HOLLAND.

August 12, 1825.

To the Rev. John Fullagar, Minister of
Unitarian Chapel, Chichester.

Southern Unitarian Fund.

THE Annual Meeting of this Society was held at Portsmouth, on the 20th of September, when the Rev. Michael Maurice, of Southampton (late of Frenchay) delivered two useful and impressive discourses; in the morning, on the scripture doctrine of Regeneration, (from John iii. 7,) and in the evening, (from Isa. liii 7,) he encouraged his audience to increased efforts in publishing this "good news of peace and salvation" to the whole race of man. The introductory and devotional services were conducted by the Revds. J. Fullagar, W. Hughes, J. B. Bristowe, and E. Kell. An interesting report was read by the Rev. Russell Scott, the Secretary.

The Society has persevered for several years past in giving popular lectures on week evenings, in hired rooms, and inviting public attention by means of handbills. Although there are two old established places of Unitarian worship in Portsmouth, experience has shewn that by pursuing this plan in the adjoining town of Portsea, and the suburbs, many persons have heard the word of life and peace, and received it gladly, who would never have strayed from their accustomed folds on the Lord's Day; others, attracted by mere curiosity, have had their feelings interested, and their minds directed to religious inquiry; even orthodox watchmen who came to detect the supposed sophistry which was seducing sheep from their fold, have by this means been transformed into zealous defenders of Unitarianism.

The Society has been and is now anxious to extend its operations to other towns. In one situation, two individuals offered their houses for the purpose of lectures; but the Committee, finding on further inquiry, that one of them was in danger of being turned out of doors, and the other deprived of a principal means of support for his family, if their generous offers were accepted, could not consent that these worthy persons should be the victims of their Christian sincerity and zeal.

By unanimous recommendation of the Committee, the Society resolved to ally itself with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by a subscription of 5*l*.5*s*.

A numerous party partook of a friendly dinner together, which was enlivened by addresses from ministers and other members present. The Rev. M. Maurice, in acknowledging the cordial thanks presented to him for his services on this occasion, said it was truly gratifying to him, compelled as he is, by the afflicted state of his family, to separate himself from a Society endeared to him by the closest bonds of religious and social fellowship, to find himself this day re-associated with two companions of his early years, whom he had not seen for thirty-eight years, when they were fellow-students with him at the Orthodox Dissenting Seminary at Hoxton; he alluded to his venerated senior brother Mr. Scott, and his beloved class-fellow Mr. Hughes, for whom, soon after their first acquaintance, he had conceived the affection of a brother by nature as well as by grace. Mr. M. eloquently enforced the duty of union, and rejoiced in the *centre of union* afforded by the British and Foreign Association. He had seen with regret chapels and chapel funds wrested or diverted from our cause, because the charge of contesting for them at law was too great for individuals, however, zealous, to incur; and since Unitarians had learned to act on a principle of fellowship, he had also seen the spoils wrested from the grasp of the spoiler. The cases of Marshfield and Bradford had come lately within his own immediate notice; their property would have been lost for ever, but for the Society for protecting Unitarian Civil Rights; and now that it is redeemed, by the assistance of the Unitarian Fund and the aid of neighbouring ministers and congregations, the good work is going on most encouragingly in both places.

The public services were well attended. The primitive simplicity and apostolic energy of the preacher, the importance of the subjects brought before the Society, and the freedom and ability with which they were discussed, the presence of friends from Newport, Chichester, &c., and the zeal and cordiality generally evinced, rendered this meeting one of the most gratifying we have enjoyed since the formation of the Society.

Birmingham Unitarian Tract Society.

THE Nineteenth Annual General Meeting of the Unitarian Tract Society, established in Birmingham for Warwickshire and the neighbouring counties, was held in the New Meeting house, Birmingham, on Wednesday 27th July, at 11 o'clock A. M.

The Rev. James Hews Bransby, of Dudley, commenced the devotional service

and read the Scriptures; the Rev. Charles Berry, of Leicester, offered the general prayer; and the Rev. W. Johnson Fox, of London, delivered an eloquent and appropriate discourse on "*zeal for pure religion*," from Proverbs viii. 1—4. It is hoped that the Unitarian public will shortly have the benefit of the Preacher's excellent and interesting observations through the medium of the press, as nearly 300 copies were subscribed for at the Meeting. At the close of the religious services, John Ryland, Esq., was called to the Chair, when the usual business of the Society was transacted, and *twenty-nine* new names added to the list of members. The weather being favourable, a number of friends attended from Kidderminster, Oldbury, Wolverhampton, Newcastle, Hanley, and other neighbouring places. In the afternoon the subscribers and friends of the Society dined together at Willday's Royal Hotel, to the number of 186, which is perhaps the largest assemblage of Unitarians ever collected on a similar occasion, except in the Metropolis. The usual sentiments were proposed from the Chair, which drew forth several appropriate and impressive addresses from the gentlemen present.

Case of the Congregation at Middleton.

*Middleton, near Manchester,
June 18, 1825.*

SIR,

THE congregation of Unitarian Christians at Middleton wish to give publicity to their situation through the medium of the Monthly Repository, and request the insertion of the following statement.

They are a poor but zealous body, consisting of thirty or more families, all, with one exception, working people, who have adopted the tenets of Unitarian Christians, many of them within the last few years, from the conviction of their own minds, without any influence or persuasion, and maintained these opinions, in spite of much odium, prejudice and opposition. There is a spirit amongst them now of inquiry and reasoning, which, fostered by a little external aid, will lead to results gratifying to the friends of Unitarianism, and it is for this aid that they now earnestly and respectfully appeal to the Unitarian public. The room now used for the purpose of worship, and for the education of one hundred and fifty Sunday-school children, is inconvenient and unpleasant, in itself almost enough to prevent persons joining the congregation. A chapel lately resigned by a congregation of Calvinists is now offered for sale, and there is no place in the neighbourhood so eligible and convenient; it is believed that this chapel may be bought

and put into repair for about 300*l.*, and there are two cellars under it, used as dwellings, which are let for 9*l.* a year. A subscription has been entered into amongst the congregation themselves, which has produced about 30*l.*, and it is expected that this sum may be made into 50*l.* by them. Their friends at Manchester have subscribed liberally, and promised very considerable aid. Several of the congregations in the neighbourhood are expected to afford some assistance, and for the rest they must throw themselves upon the charity of the friends to the propagation of their doctrines. They most urgently request the assistance of Fellowship Funds, which they trust will be granted to them, although no direct application is made to each separately.

It may be proper to state, that the congregation have hitherto borne the current expenses without difficulty, and have been indefatigable in forming a good Sunday school, which indeed may now be considered the best in the town. Some late additions to the congregation will enable them to bear the additional expense, in case of obtaining the chapel, with equal facility. A preacher attached to the Missionary Society of the district will preach regularly in his turn; and they have the expectation of the assistance of some other Unitarian ministers occasionally.

A testimonial is annexed from the Missionary Society, whose members are intimately acquainted with the circumstances of the case; and it is hoped this, joined to the above simple narration of the facts, will induce the immediate aid of the friends of the cause throughout the kingdom.

We shall be greatly obliged, Sir, by your consenting to receive subscriptions on our behalf.*

For the society of Unitarian Christians at Middleton,

RICHARD AUBREY, Jun.

(Copy.)

*Ardwick Green, near Manchester,
June 18, 1825.*

The Committee of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society have authorized me to give a testimonial on behalf of the congregation of Unitarian Christians at Middleton. This congregation has been regularly supplied with preachers by the Missionary Society, and the exemplary conduct of the members, joined to their zealous perseverance in conducting a very excellent Sunday-school, established at this place, has caused this congregation to be regarded as an important one by the Missionary

* The Editor cheerfully consents.

Society. The Committee entirely approve of the congregation availing themselves, if possible, of the opportunity now afforded them to obtain a more commodious place of meeting, and strongly recommend their case to the Unitarian public, as one worthy of their support.

On behalf of the Committee,

(Signed) WM. DUFFIELD,

Secretary.

Ministerial Resignations and Appointments.

Dr. DAVID REES has given in his resignation to the Unitarians of Merthyr, alleging as a reason the narrow principle of their chapel-deed. The principle to which he objects, and which he deems incompatible with the spirit of Dissent, is contained in certain provisions of the deed to the following effect :

That a vote in the election of a minister, and in other affairs of the chapel, be restricted to contributors of ten shillings a year and upwards.

That two-thirds of the Trustees may eject a minister thus elected by the contributors; and that the minister so ejected should be ineligible for ever after.

That, when the number of Trustees is reduced by deaths to five, the contributors, as above, shall be entitled to nominate successors; the Trustees shall have the right to approve of, or reject, the persons thus nominated.

The Rev. J. B. BRISTOWE is, we hear, about to remove from Ringwood, to undertake the charge of the Presbyterian congregation at Warminster, soon to be vacant by the meditated removal of the Rev. Griffith Roberts to Hackney.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Resolutions of Protestant Peers possessing Property in Ireland, relating to the Catholic Claims.

Resolved—1. That while we acknowledge with gratitude the measures adopted by Parliament for the general improvement and prosperity of Ireland, we cannot but feel that full effect can never be given to the benevolent intentions of the Legislature while our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects labour under civil disqualification; that every accession of wealth and knowledge must, by increasing the capacity of exercising the highest civil rights, increase equally the desire of obtaining them, and thus aggravate the discontent of those who are aggrieved.

2. That the civil equality of all classes of the people would not endanger the Constitution, which is best secured by giving to all an equal interest in its sup-

port; nor the Protestant faith, which is secured by its own clear truths, and by the pious zeal of our clergy; nor property in tithes, which, like all other property, is secured by law.

3. That without such civil equality there is no hope of permanent tranquillity in Ireland, or of that perfect national union, which is alone wanting to complete the greatness of the empire, and for ever to preserve it from hostile aggression.

4. That it is expedient to do an act of justice in a time of prosperity; to confer rights while they will be received with gratitude; to confer with advantage what cannot be refused with safety; and to adopt in peace a measure which may be forced upon us in war, and which the uncontrollable course of time must evidently force upon us soon.

5. That we, the undersigned Protestant Peers possessing property in Ireland, most earnestly recommend to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, firmness, temperance and union. That we desire them to rely upon us as the determined friends of their just cause; and upon the good sense of their Protestant fellow-subjects for the ultimate recovery of their civil rights.

LEINSTER	LIMERICK
DEVONSHIRE	HUTCHINSON
BUCKINGHAM and	LISMORE
CHANDOS	GLENGALL
LANSDOWN	MEATH
DOWNSHIRE	LANDAFF
VANE LONDON-	ALBEMARLE
DERRY	SHERBORNE
WENTWORTH	DE VESCI
FITZWILLIAM	HARTLAND
KINGSTON	DILLON
DARNLEY	LUCAN
FORTESCUE	HOWTH
CLARE	MILLTOWN
CHARLEMONT	WICKLOW
DONOUGHMORE	LUDLOW
NORTHLAND	ASHBROOKE
CLIFDEN	CREMORNE
CLONBROCK	CLANMORRIS
GOSFORD	CLONCURRY
CALEDON	SLIGO
LEITRIM	CLANRICKARDE
CARYSFORT	DUNSAHEY
WATERPARK	ANNESLEY
ASHTOWN	CASTLECOOTE
RIVERSDALE	PORTARLINGTON
DUNDAS	EGMONT
DUNALLY	BRANET
WESTMEATH	WALLSCOURT
ORMOND and Os-	HARBERTON
SORY	BLESSINGTON
ESSEX	GRANARD
DERBY	ROSSMORE
NUGENT	DUNRAVEN
BESBOROUGH	

State of Catholic Question in the House of Lords.

AGES of the Lords who voted upon this question, 17th May, 1825 :—

AGE.	MINORITY.	MAJORITY.
Under 40	23.....	15
40 to 50	24.....	23
50 to 60	32.....	42
60 to 70	20.....	31
70 and upwards..	11.....	32
	110	—
Majority, as above.....		143
Bishops		27
Eight Lords, whose ages are not in the Register.....		8
		—
Majority		178
Minority	110	
Bishops	2	
Eighteen Lords, whose ages are not in the Register	18	
	—	
Minority	130	130
		—
Majority		48

It appears from the above statement, that the majority of the young Lords are in favour of Emancipation, and the number of Lords above sixty years of age are two to one against it, so that in a few years, in all probability, the measure will be carried in the House of Lords. The strength of the Opposition, therefore, lay in men whose opinions belong to the last century, not to the present. Every body knows, that after Harvey had demonstrated the circulation of the blood, no physician then living, above 40 years of age, would believe in the doctrine.—

Edinb. Mag.

Union Schools.

(See pp. 285 and 466.)

In compliance with our request, a correspondent has sent us, in a printed circular, the following proposals for establishing a Subscription Classical and Mathematical School in the East of London. The plan has been some months before the public, but has not yet been carried into effect.

"In the year 1821, a school was established at Plymouth, entitled '*The Plymouth Subscription Classical and Mathematical School*,' the object of which is to secure a superior education, under approved masters, on an economical plan.

"A gentleman, residing in the East of London, who has been an eye witness of the success attending this plan at Plymouth, having mentioned it to several friends, a meeting was called to consider the propriety of forming a similar establishment in this neighbourhood, at which the following Resolution was unanimously agreed to, namely :

"That, for the purpose of carrying so desirable a measure into effect, an outline of the Plymouth establishment be printed and circulated, at the discretion of the meeting."

"Agreeably to this Resolution, your attention is requested to the following leading features of the School alluded to.

"A capital was raised, by subscription, to purchase a suitable piece of ground, and to erect a proper school-room. This property was vested in trust, and divided into one hundred shares. The holders of one or more shares, (not exceeding three,) are constituted proprietors, from amongst whom, all the officers are elected to manage the concerns of the Institution. A Committee was chosen, and four masters, of approved talent and integrity, were appointed.

"Each shareholder may introduce one boy for every share he holds, paying an annual sum of eight guineas on each share, by quarterly instalments, for which trifling sum, every proprietor at Plymouth, obtains for his child a superior education, while, by the combination of the whole of the subscribers, a sufficient amount is raised to procure masters of the first-rate talent.

"Such (with several minor arrangements) is the plan of the Plymouth School; and it must be evident to every parent, that this mode of tuition combines, at once, all the advantages of a public and a private education. The youth (who will all be of a respectable class) will be placed under the care of masters, approved by the proprietors, during the greater part of the day; and at night, will return home, and be the objects of domestic care and vigilance, under the paternal roof, and the parents will have the double satisfaction of knowing with whom their children associate, and of watching the improvement which they make in their various studies. The education will be comprehensive, embracing all that is necessary to qualify either for commercial pursuits or professional engagements; and all these advantages will be combined with the greatest economy."

PARLIAMENTARY.

Conduct of Dissenters with regard to Catholic Claims.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

LORD HOLLAND presented a petition from the Dissenters of Wareham, in favour of the Catholic claims. The petitioners, he observed, were anxious to vindicate themselves from the imputation of opposing Catholic emancipation. They consider those petitions stated to have been presented from Protestant Dissenters, and praying for the continuance of restrictions on their Roman Catholic

brethren, to come from ignorant persons who did not understand even the grounds of their dissent from the Established Church. Indeed, he had always supposed that Protestant Dissenters would be the last persons in the country who would wish to see severe punishments, or exclusions, enforced on account of religious opinions; and he concurred with the petitioners in thinking that the cause of religion was injured by such laws.

MAY 6.

A PETITION against the Catholic claims was presented by the Bishop of BATH and WELLS, from the Protestant Dissenters of Ebenezer Chapel, in the parish of St. Mary, Marlborough. In presenting the petition, the Bishop observed, that it was one which he had great pleasure in submitting to their lordships. It expressed the sentiments of a most respectable body of Dissenters, and the manner in which they spoke of the Establishment did great honour to the church and to them. The petition was remarkable for its good sense; but there were two points which he wished to notice—first, that there was a number of females among the petitioners; and secondly, that several of the names were not in the hand writing of the petitioners. He had asked the reason of so many names appearing in one hand, and was informed that it was a usual practice in the congregation for the deacon to sign the names of other persons, they being present and authorizing the signature. If there should be any objection to the petition on this account, he would present it as merely the petition of the persons who had signed it. He wished the petition to be read at length, as the opinions it contained did honour to those from whom it came; and it was one of the best petitions in sentiment and language he ever had the honour to present in that house.

Lord KING had listened attentively to the reading of the petition, and thought the right reverend prelate must be rather singular as to his ideas of good sense, when he praised this petition so much. There appeared to be very little sense in it, and the little it contained was buried under a mass of words. He had a petition to present of a different purport. It came from the Unitarians of the town of Taunton. It expressed the sentiments of a numerous and respectable, and, what was more, a very honest body of Dissenters. Perhaps the presenting of it would give an opportunity for something to be said in the manner of a redoubtable doctor of Dublin, who fired off a double battery against the Catholics for believing too much, and the Unitarians for believing too little. The noble lord then pre-

sented the petition, which was in favour of the Catholic claims.

The Bishop of BATH and WELLS and Lord KING interchanged a few words, which were not distinctly heard below the bar.

MAY 13.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN held in his hand petitions in favour of the Catholic Relief Bill now before the house, from Bridport, Plympton, and from the Dissenters of Chichester. With regard to the first of these, he stated, that he had been instructed to say that it would not have been presented had not a petition of a different tendency been got up. The signatures to the present petition were, however, far more numerous than those attached to that which opposed the bill.

Lord HOLLAND presented a petition to the same effect from Stroud, in Gloucestershire. The petitioners were Dissenters, and the petition had been drawn up in consequence of a false notion having gone forth, that persons of the religious persuasion of the petitioners were hostile to the Catholic claims.

The Noble Lord also presented a petition in favour of the Catholics from New Ross, and from the ministers and elders of the Presbyterian Dissenters of Down and Antrim. The petitioners, in contradiction to the reports that the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland were unfavourable to the Catholic Claims, stated, that to the best of their belief the great body of Dissenters still adhered to the resolution which had been come to on that subject some years ago by the Synod of Ulster.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MAY 5.

Mr. DENMAN rose to present a petition, which, though signed by only three individuals, inhabitants of Derby, was every way worthy the attention of the House, since those individuals were of the highest respectability, and professed the most liberal principles. He believed the Honourable Member for Derbyshire would feel no hesitation in bearing testimony to the respectability of the parties who felt it their duty to approach the House on this occasion. They were respectively the ministers of congregations of the Presbyterian, Baptist and Independent denomination, and their reason for petitioning the House was, because they had heard that a petition had been presented to Parliament on behalf of certain persons calling themselves Protestant Dissenters, of Derby, against the Bill for the relief of Roman Catholics,—a proceeding which they held to be not only illiberal in itself, but perfectly in-

consistent with the doctrine on which the Protestant Dissenters acted. The petitioners were of opinion that liberty of conscience was a principle, sacred, universal and inalienable; and they held that any restraints placed upon it, either by pains or penalties, or by exclusion from civil situations, were acts of oppression and wrong. In conclusion, they called on the House to grant to the Roman Catholics the relief which they prayed for.

LORD G. CAVENDISH (we believe) bore testimony to the great respectability of the petitioners.

Case of Richard Carlile.

JUNE 2.

MR. BROUGHAM presented a petition from Richard Carlile, and six other individuals, whose names he mentioned. The petitioners stated, that they had been prosecuted, and were immured in different prisons of the country, for not being Christians according to the forms of the Established Church, and for stating their reasons why they were not so; and they prayed that the House would rescind the various sentences which had been passed against them, and admit them to the same toleration that was enjoyed by other Dissenters. No one who knew him (Mr. Brougham) would suppose that he was inclined to patronize any species of indecent ribaldry against the institutions of the country. He considered such ribaldry to be a crime in itself, and to be the very worst mode which could be adopted to propagate any kind of opinions. For, suppose the party who held such opinions to be right, and the rest of the country to be in the wrong, the expression of them in ribald or indecent language, was calculated to affront the feelings and rouse the indignation of those whom he ought to conciliate rather than offend, if he wished to make them proselytes. He therefore said, that if these petitioners were right, the most unwise step they could take for the extension of their doctrines, would be to attack the received doctrines of the country in low and scurrilous language. At the same time he thought that the law ought not to press too heavily upon them because they appeared to be, in a certain degree, enthusiasts and fanatics; and toleration, as well as expediency, required, that they should not be subjected to that degree of punishment which would entitle them to be considered, either by themselves or by others, as martyrs to the principles, such as they were, that they professed. If they had taken a bad way to attack the religion of the country, it was incumbent upon us not to take a bad way to defend

it; and the worst of all possible ways would be to inflict severer punishment than their offences required. Having thus endeavoured to guard himself against misconstruction, he would say, that he could conceive no harm as likely to accrue to religion from fair and free discussion; and that until the mode of discussion became so offensive as to excite against it the feelings of almost every man in the country, prosecutions for blasphemy were among the very worst methods of defending religion. That was his deliberate and sincere opinion; and he could hardly conceive any instance in which toleration could be carried too far, either to the religion professed, or to the persons professing it. He moved that this petition be brought up.

MR. PEEL made several observations, but in a tone of voice which was almost inaudible in the gallery. He was understood to concur with Mr. Brougham that prosecutions should not be instituted on the score of religious opinions, so long as those opinions were expressed in fair and temperate language: but he contended, that as soon as they vented themselves in scurrilous attacks on established institutions, they deserved the attention of the civil authorities. He maintained, that the libels published by Carlile and his fellow-petitioners were of the description mentioned by the hon. member for Winchelsea: they were revolting to the feelings of every moral man in the country, and were therefore properly selected for prosecution. He did not see how Mr. Richard Carlile could be well held up as an object of mercy to the Crown. So far from expressing any contrition for the offence he had committed, he gloried in it, and not only boasted that he would continue to repeat it, but actually carried his boast into execution. To his sister, Miss Carlile, the mercy of the Crown had been extended; and she had shown herself not undeserving of it, by refusing to participate any further in the blasphemous publications of her brother.

SIR F. BURDETT protested against the principle laid down by the Right Hon. Secretary, that a man who was suffering punishment for religious opinions, should not be entitled to any mitigation of it, unless he turned hypocrite, and retracted the opinions he believed to be true.

MR. MONCK ridiculed the idea of defending religion by prosecuting blasphemy. There was no law in America against blasphemy, and yet he believed that no country in the world was more free from what was generally called blasphemous publications.

MR. PEEL made an observation which was inaudible in the gallery.

Sir F. BURDETT contended, that upon the principles laid down by his learned friend below him, and agreed to by the Right Hon. Secretary opposite, all prosecutions for religious opinions were inexpedient. It was agreed on all hands that religious opinions ought to be tolerated so long as they were expressed in temperate language; but it was now argued, that as soon as those opinions were so expressed as to disgust every honest mind, then they ought to be visited with punishment. It appeared to him, that under such circumstances they ought not to be noticed, because, if they were so poisonous as was represented, they carried along with them their own antidote. (Hear!) It was his opinion, that if Mr. Carlile had been left to himself, and had not been prosecuted by the Government, he would at this moment have been totally unheard of; whereas by prosecuting him, the Government had given him a notoriety which he could not otherwise have acquired, and had got themselves into a scrape from which they found some difficulty in getting extricated. He thought that the infliction of great severity on any man for his opinions, no matter how offensive they might be, was the most certain way not to wean him from, but to confirm him in, those obnoxious opinions.

Mr. W. SMITH and Lord BISSING severally made a few observations—the one in favour, the other in condemnation of the prayer of the petition.

The petition was then laid upon the table.

Mr. BROUGHAM, in moving that it be printed, said, that he would take that opportunity of stating a fact which he had forgotten to state in presenting the petition. So far was the punishment inflicted on these petitioners from having put down publications of this obnoxious character, that if he was rightly informed, they were now sold openly in all parts of the town. (Hear.) It had been said, that if the discussion of religious truths were calmly conducted, it ought to be permitted. A wonderful admission truly! Why, where would be the use of the discussion of religion, if the argument was to be all on one side? (Hear.) He then pointed out the glaring inconsistency of denying to the poor the right of reading any discussion upon the truths of Christianity, and of allowing to the rich the privilege of having in their libraries the works of Gibbon, and all such writers.

Mr. HUME wished the Right Hon. Secretary opposite would answer him one question—Was not this country the only country in Europe where individuals were at present imprisoned for religious opinions? He recollected the time when

this country was filled with gladness and rejoicings because the inquisition was abolished in every country in Europe; but if our prisons continued to be filled as they were at present, with individuals suffering for religious opinions, England would succeed to the vacant post of inquisitor-general for Europe, than which he could conceive nothing more derogatory to its interests and honour. (Hear.)

Mr. PEEL declared it was quite ridiculous to talk of the prisons of the country being filled with sufferers for religious opinions, when it was notorious that there were not more than eleven persons confined for blasphemous publications; and of that number only five had been prosecuted since his accession to his present office. (Hear!)

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL defended the course which had been pursued by the law-officers of the Crown with regard to these petitioners. He contended that the prosecutions which had been instituted against them had been effectual in suppressing blasphemous publications, and argued that it was unfair to blame ministers for keeping them in prison, when they were consigned to it by a sentence of the Court of King's Bench, arising out of those prosecutions. They were most of them imprisoned for selling Palmer's *Principles of Nature*, and he would say that a more horrible, blasphemous, and scurrilous libel, than that work, had never issued from the press of any country. The juries who had tried these petitioners were not more shocked by the work itself, than by the manner in which the parties had ventured to defend it.

Mr. BROUGHAM did not blame the law-officers of the Crown for prosecuting these individuals, but rather for leaving them unprosecuted, till their offences had risen to such a height as to be thought fit ground for altering the old statute law of the country. He did not blame them for prosecuting Mr. Carlile; but he did blame them for bringing down six new acts upon the country, without trying the efficacy of those which previously were in existence. (Hear!) Long before those acts were passed, Benbow had kindly offered the throats of several individuals to the knife. Why had he escaped prosecution? If any man deserved prosecution it was that individual; but the Government abstained from indicting him and others, who were equally culpable with him, in order that they might repeat their offences, and so afford a pretext for innovating upon the constitution. (Hear!) It had been said that prosecutions were not instituted because juries would not convict. He had always said, that, though juries might not be inclined to convict for libels against the Govern-

ment, they would be ready enough to convict for libels inciting to assassination. With regard to Palmer's *Principles of Nature*, a work which he had never read, he would undertake to say that it was not half so bad as any publication of either Hume or Gibbon. Voltaire's works were full of ribaldry and indecency, and yet he had never heard that they had been prosecuted for corrupting the morals

of the ladies and gentlemen at the west end of the town. (A laugh). If works of this description were to be prosecuted, he thought that the prosecutions should be directed to the works read by the rich, instead of being confined, as they now were, to works read exclusively by the poor.

The petition was then ordered to be printed.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Indications respecting Lord Eldon. By Jeremy Bentham, Esq. 8vo. 3s.

A Paraphrase of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Explanatory Notes. By the Rev. J. G. Tolley. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel the Prophet. By J. Stonard, D. D., Rector of Aldingham, Lancashire. 8vo. 15s.

Chronology of the Kings of England, in Verse. (With a Plate of each of the Kings of England.) By the Rev. Edmund Butcher. 2s.

A Manual of Classical Bibliography, comprising a Copious Detail of the various Editions, Translations into the English and other Languages, Commentaries and Works illustrative of the Greek and Roman Classics. By Jos. Wm. Moss, B. A., of Magdalen Hall, Oxford. 2 Vols. 8vo. 17. 10s.

The History of Chivalry, or Knighthood and its Times. By Charles Mills, Esq. 2 Vols. 8vo. Vignette Titles. 17. 4s.

An Essay on the Authenticity of Ossian's Poems. By Donald Campbell, Lieutenant on the Half-pay of the 57th Regt. 2s.

On the Nobility of the British Gentry, or the Political Ranks and Dignities of the British Empire, compared with those on the Continent. By Sir James Laurence, Knight of Malta. Second Edition, enlarged. 7s. 6d.

The Literary Life of Dr. Y. L. Villanueva; or, Memoirs of his Writings and Opinions. Written by Himself. With an Appendix of Fifty-nine Spanish Documents relative to the Secret History of the Council of Trent. 2 Vols. 8vo.

Sketches of Corsica; or, a Journal Written during a Visit to that Island in 1823, with an Outline of its History, and Specimens of the Language and Poetry of the People. By Robert Benson, M. A. F. L. S. 8vo. Five Plates. 10s. 6d.

Wanderings in South America, the North West of the United States and the

Antilles, from the Year 1812 to 1825. By Charles Waterton, Esq., of Walton Hall, Wakefield. 4to 17. 11s. 6d.

Characters omitted in Crabbe's Parish Register; with other Tales. By Alexander Balfour, Author of "Contemplation." 12mo. 7s.

Legends of the North; or, the Feudal Christmas. A Poem. By Mrs. Henry Rolls, Authoress of the Home of Love, &c. 8vo. 9s.

Effusions of Love from Chatelar to Mary Queen of Scots, Translated from a Gaelic Manuscript in the Scotch College at Paris, and interspersed with Songs, Sonnets, and Notes Explanatory. By the Translator. Foolscep 8vo. 6s.

Thoughts on an Illustrious Exile; occasioned by the Prosecution of the Protestants in 1815, with other Poems. By Hugh Stuart Boyd, Esq. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A Father's Love and a Woman's Friendship. By H. R. Mosse. 5 Vols. 17. 10s.

The Rising Village, a Poem. By Oliver Goldsmith, a Descendant of the Family of the Author of the "Deserted Village." 2s. 6d.

The Travellers; a Tale, illustrative of the Manners, Customs and Superstitions of Modern Greece. By T. T. C. Kendrick. 3 Vols. 12mo. 18s.

Matilda, a Tale of the Day. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Moor, a Poem. By Lord Porchester. 8vo. 14s.

A Minstrel's Hours of Song, in Poems. By Agnes Mahoney. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

The Complete Servant; being an Exposition of the Duties and Daily Business of every Description of Male and Female Servants, with Laws relative to Masters and Servants, Tables, &c. By Samuel and Sarah Adams, Fifty Years Servants in various Families. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Labour Defended against the Claims of Capital; or the Unproductiveness of Capital proved, with Reference to the present Combinations amongst Workmen. By a Labourer. 1s.

A Series of Tables, in which the Weights and Measures of France are reduced to the English Standard. By the late C. K. Sanders. 8vo. 7s. 6d. Boards, or 8s. 6d. Half-bound.

Notes to Assist the Memory, in various Sciences. Foolscap 8vo. 5s. 6d.

The Art of Improving the Voice and Ear, and of increasing their Musical Powers, on Philosophical Principles. Post 8vo. 8s.

The State of the Jews in the Beginning of the 19th Century. Translated from the Dutch of M. Paul Van Hermert, by Lewis Jackson. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Quarterly Theological Review and Ecclesiastical Record. Vol. I. 8vo. 12s.

Remains of the Venerable Missionary Swartz, consisting of Letters and Journals, never before published in this Country. 8s.

The Advancement of Society in Knowledge and Religion. By James Douglas, Esq. 8vo. 8s.

The Christian Religion made Plain, in a Dissuasive from Methodism: with an Appendix, on the Probability of Punishment being Corrective, the Trinity, &c. By Richard Boucher, Rector of Bright Waltham, Berks. 8vo. Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

A Reply to the "Letter of the Rev. J. Birt, of Manchester, to Dr. Wardlaw, on certain Passages of his Dissertation on Infant Baptism." By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. 8vo. 1s.

Bible Society.

The Turkish New Testament incapable of Defence, and the True Principles of Biblical Translation Vindicated, in Answer to Professor Lee's Remarks on Dr. Henderson's Appeal. By the Author of the Appeal.

Roman Catholics.

The Claims of the Church of Rome Examined and Confuted, in Two Sermons. By T. Raven, B. A., Minister of Trinity Chapel, Preston. 2s.

Popery Unmasked, being an Answer to T. Baddeley's "Sure Way." By James Richardson, M. A., one of the Vicars Choral of York.

Sermons.

Preached on several Occasions, in the Island of Barbadoes. By W. J. Shrews-

bury, late Wesleyan Methodist Missionary in that Island. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Lectures on the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia. By J. Wadsworth. 6s. 6d.

Single.

Preached in All Saints' Church, Northampton, June 16, 1825, before the Northampton Committees in Aid of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. By Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A Charge at the Primary Visitation of the Diocese of Gloucester, June and July, 1825. By Christopher, Bishop of Gloucester. 4to. 2s. 6d.

Christian Sympathy: preached to the Congregation of English Protestants in the City of Rome, on Easter Sunday, April 3, 1825, on Occasion of a Collection for the Benefit of the Vaudois or Waldenses in Piedmont. By J. H. Hobart, D. D. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Preached in Lambeth Chapel, July 21, 1825, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. John Banks, D. D., Lord Bishop of St. David's. By George Chandler, LL.D., Rector of All-Souls, St. Mary-le-Bone, &c. 2s.

"What is Education?" Preached before the Society for Educating the Poor of Newfoundland. By Henry Budd, M. A., Chaplain of Bridewell Hospital. 1s. 6d.

Attempt to Demonstrate the Catholicism of the Church of England, preached in the Episcopal Chapel at Stirling, March 20, 1825, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. M. H. Luscombe, LL.D. With Notes. By W. F. Hook, M. A., Curate of Whippingham, in the Isle of Wight. 4to. 2s. 6d.

The Doctrine of the Trinity proved: preached by J. Beckworth, A. M., Vicar of Dewsbury. 1s.

On Apostolic Doctrine and Fellowship, preached in the Parish Church of Buckingham, at the Triennial Visitation of the Bishop of Lincoln. By J. Hill, A. M. 4to. 2s.

Preached at the Triennial Visitation of the Hon. and Right Rev. George Pelham, Bishop of Lincoln. By J. T. Huntley, A. M. F. L. S. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Sarum, 1825. By Charles Daubeny, LL.D. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Johns; and Turner; A Berean; J. E. R.; J. F.; and T. C. A.

Our grave correspondent might have seen that by putting the word "Anabaptist" (p. 451) within inverted commas, the writer meant to point out the word as a quotation.

A packet has been received from our American Correspondent, who, it is hoped, will receive a letter from the Editor before he reads this acknowledgment.